

THE
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1882.

ARTICLE I.—CHRIST THE INSPIRATION OF HIS OWN WORD.

BY REV. J. WILLIAMSON NEVIN, LL.D.

CHRISTIANITY begins in Christ, moves throughout in Christ, and ends in Christ. It does so doctrinally, and it does so practically. There is now, we are told, a growing recognition of this from all sides. Less than half a century ago, as some of us remember, it was quite otherwise. The very terms Christological and Christocentric, as applied to theology, were viewed by many with grave apprehension and distrust. Did they not carry with them an echo of Schleiermacher? Had they not in them a touch of Hegelian pantheism? At any rate, could they not be felt to be somehow off the track of modern evangelicalism, not harmonizing rightly with its pet traditional shibboleths, and jostling uncomfortably its working methods of religious life and belief? Be the case as it might, the system which pretended to make full earnest with the idea that Jesus Christ is himself literally the entire sum and substance of Christianity, was not in favor with our American churches generally. Where they did not openly oppose it they had at least no heart to profess it openly. But all that, it appears, is now past. The era of Christological theology has set in with a force which may be said, so far at

least as profession goes, to carry all before it. Our evangelical denominations are in a sort of haste to put themselves right in regard to this point. The significance of Christ's person is paraded on every hand, as the only true centre of Christianity, as the only real soul of a living Christian faith.

So far as it goes this is of course well. We have reason to be pleased with it, even if it be open to some question; and may say with St. Paul to the Philippians, "whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached, and we do therein rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." The only wonder in the case is that there could ever be any room, among professing Christians, to think or speak of Christianity as *not* being Christological in this general view. For is it not a Gospel truism, for all those who believe in the Gospel, that Christ is for the spiritual world what the sun is for the natural world? So that a solar system without the light and poise of its proper centre in such form must be taken as a faint image only of what God's new creation in Christ Jesus would be, without the presence in it of the Lord of life and glory himself forever ruling it in like central way.

But we may not rest here in this merely general view. All the great truths of Christianity come before us first of all under such general or common aspect; but only that they may be filled out then afterwards with specific particulars and details, by which they are carried forward continually more and more toward the fulness of their proper sense in God. Only as they thus live and move toward the infinite, first on earth and afterwards in heaven, can they be said to be truths at all. How, then, must it not be thus also with the fountain head of all Christian truths, Jesus Christ himself, when brought within the telescopic range of human or angelic vision? For any seriously thoughtful mind the question answers itself.

It is characteristic of the age at large that the central significance of the person and life of Christ for Christianity is making itself felt among men as never to the same extent before. This among infidels and skeptics, as well as among professing

believers. The feeling grows on all sides that here in some way the inmost meaning of Christianity is at length reached; and that here accordingly is to be fought that mystical battle of Armageddon which is to test its full truth finally in the "great day of Almighty God." One striking evidence of this we have in the amount of literature our century has produced, and is still going on to produce, devoted to the object of reducing the history of Jesus Christ to the plane of other history for the common understanding of men. "Lives of Christ" follow one another from every side, pretending to interpret the evangelical narrative in this way, with more or less popular interest. But they have no power, as we can easily see, to make themselves live. Whatever may be their learning or skill, they fail one after another to give any general satisfaction, and the field remains still open as ever for new ventures and trials of literature ambitiously struggling to solve in such form the great question, What think ye of Christ? There is, however, a world of instruction in all this. It is one among many other signs showing the Christological drift of things in the Church and outside of the Church at the present time. Showing with unerring certitude where the full focus of the movement is to be sought and found, as being nothing less in fact than the Divine Humanity of Jesus Christ shining in his Word. And showing, at the same time, the utter futility of all attempts to bring what is thus the mystery of godliness under bondage to any power lower than itself. For just there, may we not say, lies the insurmountable weakness of these Christ biographies, as also of much else among us claiming to be Christological in like literary or scientific way. They are at best efforts to master the true inward life of Christ from his natural outward life. They may possibly believe that there was in him, along with his humanity somehow, a real divine presence; but whether they so believe or not, their attention is fixed for the time at least on his historical manhood wholly, and their literary task is felt to be such a presentation of this separately as may serve to make him historically intelligible

from the human side only apart from the divine. But no such construction of Christ can ever be a true representation of his person, even on its human or outwardly historical side. It must end always in more or less distortion and wrong. In the case of any ordinary man, the body is made intelligible only from the soul that lives within it. His inward life is the only key to the sense of his outward life at every point. What must we think then of a biographical picture of Christ, the Son of God, drawn from his manifestation in the flesh under merely natural view, and without any recognition at all of the Divine Essence which lay hid in him from the beginning, and wrought mightily in him afterwards through the entire course of his earthly life, till all, outward and inward, passed together into glory—"the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth!" Is it any wonder that representations of Christ thus earthly and mundane should fail to do any sort of justice to the true sense of his presence in the world? Need we be surprised that they are found to be flat miscarriages in literature as well as in theology, and that men should turn from them without edification; the visage of the Master in them being "so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men?"

Altogether it is easy to see that there is wide room for variations in the Christological idea of religion, turning on degrees of more remote or nearer approach to the actual living personality of the glorified Redeemer himself. The idea may appear outside of the sphere of divine revelation altogether—not without force even then, as bearing analogical witness to its own real though unknown central sun of righteousness, in the one only true Christ. It may meet us thus in Pagan myth, in Oriental pantheism, in Grecian philosophy, or in German religious speculation. And then, of course, within the range of nominal Christianity, it can easily enough adapt itself to all the reigning forms of Christian belief; assuming a phase suitable to each, if only there be a prevailing tendency and pressure in this direction, as we have seen to be the case remarkably in our

own age. We may have thus more or less heretical as well as orthodox Christologies; we may have them in either Catholic or Protestant form; they can be Unitarian or Episcopalian, Lutheran or Reformed, Presbyterian or Methodist, just as we have theologies now in all this variety of phase; all theology being destined in fact, to pass sooner or later into some sort of Christological life, if it be not doomed to end in miserable effete smoke. This just as surely as that word of the Apostle is true, "There is one God, and One Mediator between God and men, the MAN CHRIST JESUS." In other words, the Human Christ is for men the one only medium of knowing or approaching the one only true God. The maddest of all insane dreams under heaven is that of a theology or science of God, outside of his Son Jesus Christ.

All these Biblical Christologies are entitled to respect. They are significant voices in the wilderness of our nineteenth century, harbingering the long-expected new advent of our Lord, and calling upon men to prepare his way and make his paths straight. If the more remote voices from the outside deserve attention, as we have seen, much more these which sound upon us from the bosom of our common Christianity itself. But the very fact of their variant expression and tone is sufficient to show, that these too are not to be taken as exponents of the Christological idea in all its fulness. They must be considered as still obscure and feeble approximations only to what this is in its central effulgence, as the three disciples, for example, caught a glimpse of it when they were with him on the mount of transfiguration.

It is not necessary here to enter into any comparison of these voices one with another, on the part of our different Christian denominations, with the view of determining their relative degrees of worth, as so many different testimonies of Jesus Christ. That depends wholly on their different nearness to the actual personal presence of the Lord as it meets us in his Word. For our present purpose it is enough if we can but be brought to see and know practically in the central light of this presence itself (though it be still

only afar off), to what extent even our best approaches toward the truth here fall short of anything like an adequate apprehension of what the truth is in its own supernatural glory. Our seeing is for the main part not seeing at all, but only a sort of helpless groping after that knowledge of Christ which St. Paul daringly calls "being filled with all the fulness of God;" and which is for him so transcendently glorious that in the Epistle to the Ephesians all language, in his attempting to describe it, breaks down as it were with the overpowering sense of its own impotence. The Christological science and life of Christianity is yet in its poor infancy. Far more glorious things are spoken of thee, thou city of our God! as thou art to be hereafter. It is of the Church of the Future, and not of any past Church, that the Prophet sings: "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people; but Jehovah (that is, without any qualification, Jesus Christ) shall arise upon thee; and his glory shall be seen upon thee. And the gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising" (Is. lx. 23). Note well; it is the outbreathing light of the Lord himself, the glory hid in him thus far but now disclosing itself from heaven, as a power higher than all the world, to which is ascribed all this wonder-working theophany. It is in other words the vision of St. John: "I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband" (Rev. xxi. 1, 2).

There is a simply mechanical way of looking at Christ and his kingdom; as when all the great things spoken of him are apprehended as on the outside of the beholder, and both doctrine and precept are received then in the form simply of outward natural fact, with what we may call mere outward faith and obedience.

Then again there is, interior to this, an intellectual or theo-

retic way of taking in the same objects, the realities and facts of the Gospel from centre to circumference; as when they are made, through instruction and reflection, to put on something of scientific shape, and seem thus to enter in some degree into the actual spiritual life of the believer.

Both these methods, the outwardly mechanical and the inwardly theoretic, have their great value. We cannot come into the kingdom of God by regeneration without them. They are the necessary stages of spiritual childhood and youth for all of us, in our progress toward full new manhood in Christ Jesus. But they do not necessarily reach this consummation. Thousands with such experience, come short after all of the Christian new birth. Only where outward obedience and inward knowledge come ultimately into the very essential life of the Lord himself, who is the soul of his universal kingdom, have we at last the real Christological mystery of redemption and salvation.

And thus it is that we are brought finally to the inmost and highest mode of looking at Christ and his kingdom; that by which we communicate directly with the veritable life of the Lord himself, and so are made to see him in some measure as he is in his own actual being, high above all terrestrial and even celestial glory in every lower form. In distinction from the mechanical and theoretic modes of apprehending divine things this may be denominated the vital mode. It brings us to the conception of Christian faith in its true and full form. There is room indeed to speak of faith, and so of life also, as belonging to the lower planes of knowledge we have named. But that then is only through obscure derivation of light into these lower spheres from the sphere above them, when they are found in what we have just seen to be their only normal relation to this, as precursive stadia toward the coming of the new man in Christ Jesus. In themselves, outside of this heavenly revelation, they have in them no life, and no light, and therefore no vision of faith; because there can be in them no radiation from the great centre of all being, the love of God

in his Son Jesus Christ. Just here it is that we have the true idea of faith, as distinguished from all inferior knowledge and intelligence. It is the vision of God in God, the seeing of divine things in their own divine light. Unintelligible mystery and nonsense of course to the universal natural mind; but the only key nevertheless that can ever surely open to us the interior sense of the Bible. For the Bible is full of it, Old Testament and New, from beginning to end. It is the evidence and demonstration of things which are supernatural and invisible to mere worldly sense or thought or reason, because it is itself born of them and is the power of seeing them therefore as they are in their own light. "It is not of yourselves," says St. Paul, "it is the gift of God" (Eph. ii. 8). Only we must not think of it then in the outward mechanical or in the merely theoretic way; it comes into us in the way of actual life from the Lord, reaching us by the living word of the Lord, which is thus at once then both this word itself and its own vision in our souls from the Lord himself. His life from the beginning, we are expressly told, has been the only true light of men (John i. 4); which is also the meaning of the Psalmist when he says: "With thee is the fountain of life; IN THY LIGHT SHALL WE SEE LIGHT" (Ps. xxxvi. 9).

From this mount of vision alone, then, which has been made accessible for us and possible only in the Divine Humanity of our glorified Lord Jesus Christ; even as it is said to this day, that is forever, IN THE MOUNT OF THE LORD IT SHALL BE SEEN (Gen. xxii. 14); from this celestial elevation alone, and not from any lower height, may we ever dream of taking in even approximatively anything like a true apprehension of the glorious majesty of Christ, as it shines forth upon us from the inmost bosom of the Christian Revelation. It is insanity, indeed, the direct opposite of all right reason, so much as to think even of studying or interpreting such a presence—the fulness of the Godhead bodily—from any merely mundane view, from any standpoint lower than the supereminent light of this glorified presence itself. It comes to nothing to be told

that we are here in the body, and therefore hopelessly shut up to terrestrial thinking; and that any revelation of the divine, to be for us at all a true revelation, must be first of all in common terrestrial form and speech; which would seem to imply that the terrestrial is a real possible ladder for climbing to the divine; and thus that the outward natural presence of Christ in the flesh may be regarded as being in some way a valid and sufficient opening for us, in and of itself, into the proper sanctuary of his higher spiritual life. All such thought, plausible as it may seem, must be considered untrue; as is shown indeed at once in its application to the case of our Lord himself, where in reference to Peter's only right answer to his question, *Whom say ye that I am?* he speaks those memorable words: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." No communication of the natural with the real spiritual and divine can ever have place, which is not brought to pass by the coming down of the divine first, through the spiritual, into the sphere of the natural; not to stay there by any means as part of the natural, but to lift this as it were out of nature, and above it, into the sphere of the supernatural. That is just the great lesson by which our Lord so solemnly enforces the doctrine of regeneration on the mind of Nicodemus, when he says: "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven" (John iii. 13). That was the order of his own historical redemption, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world and go to the Father" (John xvi. 28). And to this heavenly pattern is conformed, through all ages, the regeneration of every true believer in Christ, and the universal life of the true Christian Church, to the end of time. Herein consists the peculiarity of the Christian life in distinction from all life, natural, intellectual, moral, or practical, proceeding from the merely mundane side of our humanity. It is not only a new birth, but a birth from above, predestination on the part of God to conformity with the image of his Son,

that he might be literally the FIRSTBORN among many brethren (Rom. viii. 29). And not this only to start with; a supposed divine afflatus or paroxysm from on high, stirring the natural life into some sort of outward spiritual activity as from itself, and then allowing it to fall back again to the old self; but such new birth rather, as a continuous ongoing of the life from above, determined by the sense of a new will, a new selfhood centering in God, drawing after it a new understanding, and thus causing old things more and more to pass away and all things to become new.

And here, as the subject is of primary importance for any right perception of what our Lord Jesus Christ is, in the Christological view, for his kingdom, doctrine and work, at every point, I may be allowed to dwell somewhat more fully on this derivative parallelism of the new Christian life with the mystery of his own incarnation, as we have it so strikingly presented in the third chapter of the Gospel of St. John. It runs abundantly through the entire Word of God, for those whose eyes the risen Christ has opened to understand the Scriptures (Luke xxiv. 25-27, 31, 32, 45); but this chapter especially must be considered of classical account for the whole subject.

The notion of regeneration was not wanting among the Jews. They took it, however, in the sense merely of a great moral change, falling within the range of the natural possibilities of our natural human life. In such outward view, moreover, it was easy for them also to allow it a place in their expected kingdom of the Messiah; just as thousands of professing Christians conceive of it still. Nicodemus, an earnest and profoundly thoughtful man, standing of course in the bosom of the reigning Jewish tradition (where all the apostles stood before Christ's resurrection), but having in him susceptibilities for a more spiritual apprehension of divine things, on which the presence of our Lord yet in the distance had begun already to work with mysterious awakening effect, came to him by night with the salutation: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher sent from God; for no man can do these miracles

that thou doest, except God be with him." In its degree, it is an act of faith in Christ, the expression of a wish to come within the range of his heavenly teaching; and no doubt there was latent in it, though he knew it not, the principle of a real drawing of the Father which carried with it the essence of faith in its highest form. But in itself it was not yet such faith by any means. It had reference to the kingdom of God, under a view which fell vastly short of its true celestial sense, and which involved, therefore, after all, only the most poor conception of the Saviour himself. It saw in him still only a Jewish rabbi, a human teacher sent from God like Moses or John the Baptist, a man armed with the power of doing miracles beyond other men in proof of his mission. But that was only outward, mechanical belief, or at best no more than intellectual or theoretic belief. It did not reach to the holy of holies, the abode of the shekinah, as it tabernacled in the actual person of the Divine Teacher himself. What Nicodemus needed first of all was to be made aware of this solemn fact.

The dialogue that follows has to do accordingly with the secret mind of the master of Israel, more than with his open speech; and is given indeed as an example of what is said immediately before, that "Jesus knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man, because he knew what was in man." Hence what seems abrupt here in the letter, moves throughout with most regular sequence in the spirit. All goes to enforce the idea of regeneration, the new birth, or birth from above, as the indispensable prerequisite for seeing the kingdom of God or entering into it; in such terms as to leave no room for any sort of doubt that this must come wholly from above, and in no sense whatever from below. The natural side of our life can contribute nothing to it; that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and can never raise itself to anything higher. Only that which is born in man of the Divine Spirit can be spirit in him and not flesh. Here then no outward law, no doctrine for the understanding, no morality or virtue from the natural will (itself flesh only and not spirit) could in any de-

gree open the way, either to the knowledge of the kingdom of God, or to the knowledge of Christ through whom the kingdom was now actually at hand. No wonder that Nicodemus exclaims at last, in a sort of reverent despair, How can these things be? Let us call it however a wholesome despair; not negative but affirmative rather toward the words of One, in whose person now, perhaps, he began to feel darkly the true answer to his own doubting cry.

For that, in truth, was just the end to which our Saviour wished to bring the dialogue from the beginning; namely, the idea of the kingdom of heaven as proceeding from himself, centreing in himself, ending in himself. All things belonging to it of him, in him, and unto him forever; according to his own word, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last."

Here then the argument at once soars to its native home. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen, and ye receive not our testimony. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things." The earthly things here do not mean just common physical or secular things; but rather things of religion in earthly form. All divine revelation has in this way necessarily what we may call an earthward side, an external human visage, inclosing within it, and thus outwardly representing, its true inward life and spirit on the heavenward side. Where faith comes to its proper supernatural office, the heavenly becomes in a degree lucent through the earthly, the letter is made to be as it were diaphanous for the spirit. But without this, the earthly is simply terrene, and sinks to the character of "flesh, which profiteth nothing." Over against such abstract view of the earthly in the things of revelation, our Lord intones now with all emphasis the absolute supremacy of the spiritual and divine in all religion, as resident high above the whole universe of created existence, once and forever, in his own person. There the kingdom of God, the reality and truth of all religion, were

no longer matters to be tried by human thought or by any measurable intelligence; but matters of self-testimony, having their evidence wholly in him, the Messiah himself speaking these words, and to be certified therefore to the human spirit by himself alone. "We speak that we *do know*; we testify that we *have seen*." This is that TESTIMONY OF JESUS CHRIST of which we hear so much in the Apocalypse; and which is there so explicitly declared to be the SPIRIT OF PROPHECY, the soul, the vital breath, the inmost inspiration of all Holy Scripture. And thus comes out the full unutterable meaning of the declaration before quoted: No man, that is no human mind, hath ascended up to heaven—in the way of understanding or will—but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven. The Son of man then, it is plain, not for himself alone, and not merely as an outward prototype and pattern to be followed by other men, but as the actual lifter up in himself of all other men who are saved to the same immortality and glory. For "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness" he immediately adds, "even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life."

And thus we are brought to the great idea of Christian faith, as being in the way we have seen before the organ in man for seeing the divine in its own light, the organ itself being born of the divine strictly and truly, and thus establishing in man a real vital nexus between the human and the divine in his own soul or spirit. Of this faith the discourse goes on to speak now to the end, resolving into it apparently the entire mystery of the Christian salvation. But it is only, as we can easily see, in virtue of the objective love of God manifested in Christ, the subjective apprehension of which—not theoretically but in the way of life-appropriation—is what faith means, that such great things are ascribed to its power. In any lower view than this it has no power whatever either to enlighten or to save. As the organ of such living communication with the glorified Christ, however, it can do all things.

It becomes the vision of God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, and not imputing unto men their sins. It sees and appropriates in him, not the promise merely, but the veritable fact of eternal life. He that believeth in him thus is not condemned, because his faith itself sets him within the sphere of that undying life; while he that believeth not is condemned already, not in the way of penal judgment for the want of such belief, but just by means of the fact itself that he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. For "this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness more than light, because their deeds were evil." What a commentary by the way on the notion current with many, that faith as a principle comes before charity, truth before good, in the order of our spiritual regeneration. It is all the other way. Faith so called without charity to start with, and to grow from, is dead and not in any true sense faith at all.

Close following now this conversation with Nicodemus, in the same chapter, we have another remarkable conversation between John the Baptist and some of his disciples; which is commonly taken perhaps for a fragment, thrust into the evangelical narrative here without special reason or motive. But that is a mistake. Looking at the inward sense of the passage, it is not hard to find in it a strict coherence with what goes before, serving wonderfully to complement the high Christological teaching of the Nicodemus interview, and sounding along with it the deep key note of all that follows in the grand oratorio of this Fourth Gospel (*Das Herz Christi* as it has been called) out to the full end.

"Rabbi," the disciples of John say unto him, "he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to HIM." John here stands for the entire Jewish religion, and indeed for all that lay behind it also in the way of older revelation. In this respect, he was greater than all the prophets before him, because nearest of all to the actual coming of Christ, and gather-

ing into his ministry as a focus the voice of all ages heralding the glorious event. Yet none knew better than John himself that he was not the Christ, and that even the highest which was in him as a prophet came from above, and was of itself less than nothing, over against the boundless fulness of the Divine now bringing into the world the kingdom of heaven, as he saw it flesh-enshrined in the Son of man. "Ye yourselves bear me witness," he tells his disciples, "that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before him." This my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease. Then follow words that seem to echo the very sense of the high discourse with Nicodemus: "He that cometh from above is above all; he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth; he that cometh from heaven is above all. And what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth; and no man receiveth his testimony." Here again, as before, we have the idea of Christ's self-testimony, proceeding directly from his own life, supreme in the heavenly world, transcending infinitely all lower forms of existence, and allowing no witness from beyond itself to have any part in the authentication of its claims. No man, from below upward, receiveth the testimony; just as we have seen before that no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven. The movement in both cases is from above downward, before it can be from below upward. Hence it is added here with otherwise unintelligible expression, "He that does receive his testimony hath set to his seal that *God is true*;" not that the man by his seal authenticates the truth in any way, but that the truth, which he thus owns as supremely divine in Christ, authenticates or seals the man himself unto everlasting life.

And is not this again, we may ask, just that same faith, "born not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" in Jesus Christ, which we have seen to be nothing less than the power of seeing the things of heaven, immediately and directly, in their own supersensible and heavenly light? What is it to believe the testimony of God in any case, the

inspiration of God in his own Word, if it be not thus to set seal to it obediently as in itself the highest truth and no lie?

So it follows: "For he whom God hath sent"—in the eminent sense here affirmed of Christ—"speaketh the WORDS OF GOD"—words that are themselves spirit and life; "for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him. The Father loveth the Son"—sees in him his own eternal essence—"and hath GIVEN ALL THINGS INTO HIS HAND." And thus we have the great conclusion as before: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life;" his faith vitally conjoining him with the Lord is itself the very status of that life; while then of course, "he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

In our Christological estimate of the gospel, viewed in this way from its highest summit in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, we are confronted at once with the two great mysteries which enter into the constitution of his person; namely, the mystery of the Holy Trinity and the mystery of his Holy Incarnation. These, it is easy to see, are beyond all natural thought, and belong to a region which is infinitely higher than the highest finite intelligence. But it is wrong to think of them as being therefore without inward relation to our human rationality, having for us no force other than that of blind external authority. Agnosticism proves itself blind and irrational in pretending philosophically to exclude in this way all knowledge of the spiritual world. But what better is it for the friends of revelation, Catholic or Protestant, to intrench themselves in the same plea of the absolutely unknowable, when they find themselves otherwise driven to the wall in the defence of any of their doctrines? The obedience of faith, in Paul's sense, never means that; for faith, as we have been now looking at it in the sense of our Lord himself, is heaven-wide apart from all such wilful agnosticism. It rises high above all mechanical bondage; leaves behind it for this purpose the whole sphere of mere natural science, ratiocination, and outward tradition; only, however, that it may come into the

pure empyrean of God's true spiritual revelation, where alone, amid the powers of the world to come, may be realized the full import of our Saviour's declaration: "If ye continue in my Word (which is the very light of the highest reason), ye shall be my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there, and only there, is liberty along with heavenly intelligence and light. Let us beware then of turning the high doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation into the dead lumber of mere outward memory and confession. Do they not meet us everywhere in the gospel as the cardinal pillars of Christian theology, the underlying forces of the universal Christian life? What must we think of our Christianity then, if we see in them no practical relation to either, but imagine we have to do with them only as abstractions, which cannot enter our intelligence or will in any way, but resolve themselves at last into empty words simply and nothing more?

The Divine Trinity comes into intelligible view only in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ. "No man (outside of him) hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." Not theoretically of course; not doctrinally; but as being himself actually the life, and power, and glory of the Father. "No man knoweth the Father," he himself tells us, "but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Through the Son there is a real knowing of the Father, and so of the whole Trinity; not indeed the infinite knowing which belongs to the Son; but still in its finite degree of one nature with that; not black agnosticism by any means, but a real revelation, making itself known as the light of life from God in the rational soul of every true believer.

Manifested in this way, the Holy Trinity comes before us, not as a dead fact, but as an organized living and working Infinite Love, Infinite Wisdom, and Infinite Power, whose threefold distinction may never be separated for a moment from its fundamental unity; the oneness and the

threeness therefore never to be thought of under the same mental category. Holding the mystery strictly, as we must, to the person of Christ, in whom only it is revealed, there is no room for any doubt in regard to its general constitution and order. He is its only manifestation, the central unity in which its whole triplicity comes together as an object of faith. "In him dwelleth," we are told, "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." That at once makes him to be the very wholeness of God, the one only absolute and true God. We have no right to think of God in any other form; and when we do so, we are but dealing with a metaphysical abstraction, which is at bottom a denial of his actual being altogether. Nothing can be clearer or stronger than the self-testimony of Christ, in his Word, on this point. He and the Father are one; all things of the Father are his; and in him is comprehended in like manner the entire presence and working of the Holy Ghost. "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." All other view of the Divine is but the creature of man's own imagination, vain and false. And therefore it is added solemnly, "Little children, keep yourselves from idols" (1 John v. 20, 21).

The doctrine of the Trinity thus, in Jesus Christ, is supremely practical, passing safely the shoals of Deism, Unitarianism, and Mohammedanism on the one hand, while it avoids on the other hand the no less common and dangerous heresy of Tritheism, the worship of three Gods instead of one.

The mystery of Christ's manhood again, the union of the divine and human, in his incarnation, follows closely the mystery of his threefold divinity. A wrong theodicy, a wrong conception of the being of God, in the direction either of Unitarianism or Tritheism, is sure to draw after it a wrong conception also of the human side of Christ's coming in the flesh. It makes it impossible to do full justice to his humanity, either turning it into a Gnostic phantasm, or else resolving it

dualistically into our ordinary human life (Psilanthropism) joined to his higher divine nature in some mysterious but only external way. But this is in fact to strike a blow at the whole doctrine of the incarnation, and goes as far as it prevails to rob it of its proper meaning altogether as the wisdom and power of God unto salvation.

The incarnation could be no sudden fact, brought to pass at once by a mere fiat of the Almighty. That would be a magical wonder only, and no real entrance into the true historical life of the world. So it is sung in the old hymn: "Thou art the king of glory, O Christ; thou art the everlasting Son of the Father. When thou tookest upon thee to deliver man, thou didst humble thyself to be born of a virgin. When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers." Here at once we have the idea, not of something accomplished at once in his birth, but of a long life work of trial and toil through his own voluntary letting down of himself into the fallen life of the world; by entering it in the way of ordinary human birth, and so following it out progressively, stage after stage, to what he knew must be for him its bitter end; if he were to bring to pass the great task of human deliverance which he took upon him when he came into the world.

Vast obscurity is thrown upon this subject, from not distinguishing properly between the general work of redemption and the particular work of salvation. The first is what is referred to in the quotation just made from the Ambrosian hymn, the "deliverance of man," the human race generically considered; which in the nature of the case must go before the salvation of particular men; as it runs so grandly in the words, "When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers." This general or universal opening of the kingdom of heaven forms the ground tone of the entire Ambrosian hymn; as also of the Benedictus or Hymn of Zacharias. The opening of heaven is universal; but not the personal salvation; this as a matter of

course limits itself to believers. It is only glimpses we gain from the Bible of the general opening of the kingdom of heaven through the travail of Christ's soul, in his weary journey from the womb of the virgin to his death on the cross. These glimpses we have through outward occasional facts and declarations, which however must be regarded always as only dimly representing what he was called to encounter in his inward spiritual life; while in the nature of the case the actual experiences of that life altogether must infinitely transcend all that can enter intelligibly the highest thought either of men or of angels.

The Old Testament prophets speak of these experiences as battles with the hosts of hell in their united strength, issuing in glorious victories always achieved by the sole and unassisted power of the Messiah.

In the New Testament they are described as sore and grievous temptations. These, such as to justify that startling language in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared; though he were a Son yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him" (Heb. v. 7-9). In the presence of such a statement we may be sure, that what is said of his sufferings in Gethsemane,—the exceeding sorrow, the agony, the bloody sweat—is only a transient unexaggerated picture of what his inward life was all along; the "man of sorrows and acquainted with grief" (Is. liii). Not through fear of any outward cross certainly, but in view of that "sharpness of death" in his own soul, by which only it was possible for him to reconquer in himself first of all the territory of our fallen humanity otherwise hopelessly enslaved to the prince of this world; so that being thus exalted and glorified he might open the kingdom of heaven to all believers.

The unspeakable temptations of Christ, his sore conflicts

with the Prince of this world, the universal power of hell, came upon him of course wholly through the medium of his humanity; and were the inevitable hard task he proposed to himself when he undertook to clothe his immaculate divinity with human form. His humbling himself to be born of a virgin was but the beginning of that task; his life throughout from this point onward was the progressive unfolding of what was thus begun till the process became complete finally in his glorification. A process that could not go forward under any view of mere passive growth, but only by the free intelligence and will of the divine man himself who was the subject of it, and in the face of the most adverse conditions confronting it at every point. It is not in our way now to speak of these more particularly. Enough to know that they lay in the very path of the divine *Menschwerdung* itself, by which the *Redeemer* became Man for us men and our salvation. Only so could he become the organ of our human redemption. Only so could he be perfected, so as to become the "captain of our salvation" leading many sons to glory.

The carrying out of his incarnation in this manner to its utmost result, is just what our Lord means when he says in his last prayer: "I have glorified thee on the earth; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." And in full substantiation also of what has here been said of his glorifying himself in this way to be the organ of redemption for his people, we hear from him farther on in the same prayer those remarkable words: "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth." Language which means plainly, that the work of his life had been to bring to pass in himself first of all a pure and undefiled manhood, in full union with God, which should then be for others also a fountain of living righteousness from the truth thus stored up in his person.

And here it is only we reach the ultimate and full sense of this great mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh, the

union of the human and the divine in the person of Jesus Christ. It is not the divine, hovering over the human as an existence separate from itself. We may not say less of it than what is said in the Athanasian Creed: "God and man, yet not two but one Christ. One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by assumption of the manhood into God. One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ." This indeed is signified at once by the two clauses in the Apostles' Creed, "Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary." For we cannot really believe these two propositions, if the human be not for us, in its ultimate completeness, transfused with the inmost essence of the divine.

And who may not see that nothing less than this is involved in that memorable declaration: "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Not derivative or secondary life in any sense, but original absolute life, such as it is in the essence of the Father. This, therefore, not by empowering outward commission of any sort, but as *IN HIMSELF*. *Given*, it is true, by the Father; but the word *given* here, like the word *sent* so often applied to the relation of the Son to the Father, is itself the strongest possible argument of the full co-essential Divinity of the Son and the Father. For what can be more preposterous than to imagine a transference of the absolute divine, at any point, over to an agency which is not itself absolutely divine? But if life, absolute life, eternal life, the gift of the living God, be thus in the glorified Humanity of Christ, "him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world," need we be surprised to find the attributes of this life—thus co-essential with the Divine life in its highest form—ascribed to the whole personality of Christ in the same way? The Scriptures on this subject, Old Testament and New, are altogether too plain to admit of any question. They unequivocally predicate of his Humanity infinite properties, all wisdom and knowledge, all power in heaven

and in earth, in one word all things of the Father without any sort of stint or limitation.

Over against such testimony, the objections of the natural human mind, drawn from the material conditions of our common humanity, amount to nothing. In the spiritual world those conditions are not known. The human forms even of the angels there transcend all notion we can have of them here. How much more, the glorified humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ, exalted as it is "far above all principality, and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come" (Eph. i. 21). Alas, that our theology should be too weak commonly to follow the Son of man, ascending up in this way not only into heaven, but "far ABOVE ALL HEAVENS, that he might fill all things" (Eph. iv. 10). Alas, that our common Christianity should be so generally shorn of its strength just here, by not seeking it, where only it is to be found, in the Divine Man Jesus Christ.

This is the very centre and inmost sanctuary of the Catholic faith, which except a man believe truly and firmly, says the Athanasian Creed, he cannot be saved. Nothing in itself more plain and simple; and yet, for the very reason of this simplicity we may say, the hardest of all things for the natural mind to receive.

The presence of the entire being of God in Christ, it costs us much to learn in the first place; but how much more to come down (with babes and sucklings) to the owning of this, in the actual manhood of Christ, itself made divine through the fulness of the Godhead dwelling within it. "My Lord and my God," Thomas exclaimed, when the evidence of sight forced him to such confession. "Blessed are they that have not seen," said the risen Saviour, "and yet have believed."

Why did God become man? First of all, to bring himself within the knowledge and reach of men in their fallen state. "To this end was I born," Jesus said to Pilate, "and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth" (John xviii. 37). We are apt to think of truth as

something to which witness might be borne in a different way. But, with Christ, truth and life are identical, and both to be found only in living union with God. The fall of man in this view was a real lapse from the original plane of his existence, which broke his direct communion with heaven and God as it stood in the beginning, and made it impossible for him either to know God or to come near him in any living way. Redemption, in these circumstances, could be only by a descending movement on the part of God himself, so as to establish a new plane of revelation accessible to the otherwise helpless and hopeless condition of the human race. He must rend the heavens and come down, in order to raise men to honor, glory and immortality. Hence the Incarnation. It was to bear witness to the truth, by causing it, not only to come near to men as doctrine, but into them as life through restored communication with the essential fountain of all life in God. Not as knowledge simply, nor as example simply, nor as ideal simply; but as actual spiritual substance born directly from the substance of the Divine itself.

Such a movement must involve of course offices and works subservient to its main design, which we may then speak of as necessary articles of faith. We have no right, however, to put any of these articles on one level with the main design as we have this clearly set forth in the Word of God. Still less to subordinate the primary main design to any such secondary article of faith; virtually turning the mystery of the incarnation thus, as is often done, into a mechanical contrivance only for attaining some other end outside of itself. Revelation and redemption here are the same thing. God making himself known in the Humanity of his Son Jesus Christ, causes this to be at once all that is needed for our salvation. That glorious appearing simply hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. Wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption, all meet us as heaven-descended realities of the new birth, brought to pass for us first of all in the accomplished fact of the incarnation. Plain as it can be put in words, the

Saviour says: "This is life eternal that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent;" that is, in and by thy SELF-MANIFESTATION in Jesus Christ thus sent into the world for this purpose. "I have glorified thy name; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. I have *manifested thy name*" (John xvii. 3-6). "The life was *manifested*, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was *manifested unto us*" (1 John i. 2).

What the Divine Humanity means as the very summit of the Christian redemption, in the view now stated, is incontrovertibly shown by the passage John vii. 39, where it is said in blank terms: "This spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Which agrees in full with all he says of the Spirit when about to leave the world. His own going back into the absolute Godhead out of which he had come into the world, was but to open the way for the mission of the Comforter, from the Father through himself thus glorified and made one with the Father, that in this new form he might abide with them forever. "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, he cannot come. When he is come he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself. He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore it is that he shall TAKE OF MINE and shall show it unto you (John xiv. 17, 20; xvi. 7, 13, 14, 15).

All that has now been said is comprehended in what is emphatically spoken of in the Bible as the NAME of Jesus Christ, which is so clearly identified with the NAME of Jehovah-God. In the true biblical view, as we know, names stand everywhere for the inmost reality and fulness of what they designate. So the name of God expresses the essence of God, the whole compass and fulness of his being. And this, the Bible teaches,

we have in its highest manifestation only in Christ; and so, not in the supposed Divinity of Christ sundered from his human life, but in his Humanity itself, made one with the Divine in his all-glorious Person, where only the incarnation becomes ultimately complete; so as to be for us in full sense Immanuel, God with us, the very love and wisdom of God in us unto everlasting life. "My Name is in Him," it was said at mount Sinai, "beware of him, and obey his voice" (Ex. xxiii. 21). It is the Jehovah of the Ten Commandments, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage;" whose living presence is thus made to be both voice and soul reaching down from heaven into the entire decalogue. In the same way we have it in the New Testament, as the inmost life of the Lord's Prayer, which also hangs organically, through all its petitions, on that first breathing of true Christian faith, "Hallowed be THY NAME." The twofold distinction of the name, as we have it in the New Testament, Jesus and Christ, but serves to intensify the full unity of its proper sense; just as the like distinction of Jehovah and God fills out the idea of the One only true God in the Old Testament. In both cases, it is the distinction between Love and Wisdom, Essence and Existence, Will and Intelligence, without which there can be no true unity of life either for God or man. *Jesus*, Healer and Saviour, because in his priestly office he saves his people from their sins by the inflowing righteousness of his own life. *Christ*, Messiah or Anointed, because in his kingly office he carries out this salvation by his truth and doctrine. *Jesus Christ*, because he is thus the one whole and entire Redeemer, in whose glorified Humanity, intervening between God and men, we have the finished result of all his sufferings and sorrows out to his passion on the cross—as sung by the angels at his birth, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will." The whole Gospel, we are told, resolves itself into this: "That ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name" (John xx. 31). With which agrees that

strong word of the apostle Peter, "There is none other NAME under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv. 12).

Our Lord Jesus Christ thus in his glorified Humanity, is the true Name of God, the highest conception of God, whether for angels or men, in one word himself the only living and true God. All that philosophy or mere natural religion may dream and prate of the Divine outside of this Name, this manifestation, is but miserable delusion. The more science and learning there may go with it, the more it is actually insane; since it but ends thus the more clearly in the deification of nature or else in sheer abstract thought. So true is it that this Christ is the sun of the universal creation of God; in strict conformity with his own word, "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness."

Thus supreme in God's creation—high above all heavens—the glorified Christ, in the totality of his Divine-Human being, may not be thought of as other than the principle and comprehension of all the works of God. His kingdom must be wide and broad as it is high and everlasting. No notion can be more fatal to Christianity, than that which makes it to be particularistic in any view (exceptional, digressive, episodic), in distinction from catholic or universal. In Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free. He is for all ages, as well as for all nations of our terrestrial world. He is for all spheres of our human existence, such as science, art, philosophy, politics, ethics, as well as religion specially so-called; only so that all these bow themselves lovingly to the power of his own super-celestial life. And this being so, his life, thus highly exalted far above all heavens, cannot be for our one small planet alone, but must ray forth its beneficent influences upon the countless other planets, which God has made to be seminaries for the peopling of heaven, as well as on the manifold angelic populations of heaven itself. Any conception of Christianity which by its premises excludes such broadness of view, derogates to the same extent from the infinite Majesty

of the Man Christ Jesus, and must prove in the end weak as water over against what is called the astronomical argument of our modern time. To meet this argument, half a century ago, the celebrated Dr. Chalmers published his so-called *Astronomical Sermons*; in which he found himself constrained to diverge in a degree from his own theological tradition, by allowing a certain interest of other worlds in our human redemption. But he did so only in the way of rhetorical hypothesis; and his book, accordingly, having no power to satisfy earnest minds, has passed into oblivion. The only true answer to the astronomical objection to Christianity, is found in a sound Christology; in which the Lord Immanuel is to be seen, not fantastically, but really and truly, irradiating all worlds with the super-celestial light of his Divine Presence.

Here only, we reach the full sense of that article of the Creed, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church;" as indeed also, of all the other articles of the Creed; for it is in Christ only that they are *yea* and *amen* in their inmost essence, having in them their true perennial life and glory. The church, or kingdom of God, is one, holy, and catholic as the universe, just because in heaven, and down through all worlds, it is the out-flowing stream of his one glorified life through all ages.

This does not imply sameness of relation to him who is thus the head of the universal church, on the part of all belonging to it. The incarnation was for the purpose of reaching the fallen; while above their plane there is an order of existence not needing redemption in the same way. They that are whole, Christ tells us, need not a physician, but they that are sick. He came not to call the righteous but sinners, to repentance. "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold." But still higher and lower here come together necessarily in the one grand constitution of heaven; occupying different planes, and making room for many mansions; but all together carrying into effect the full reach of God's saving power as it was foreseen, from the beginning, would be necessary to make the glorious system of creation eternally complete. The highest order thus

surmounts that which is below it—being nearer to the primal centre of all in the Lord, and breaking in a degree the otherwise unbearable effulgence of its light; while the lower, at the same time, serves to bring into view the entire one economy of salvation in the fulness of its stability and depth.

In this way, the incarnation constitutes the real basis of the universal structure, and forms the theme of common adoration for all the hosts of heaven, the ransomed and the unransomed alike. So we have it most clearly represented in the visions of the Apocalypse (Rev. iv. v.). Such catholic views abound in the Old Testament, for those whose eyes are in any degree unsealed to read its inward soul and sense. As, for example, in the 24th Psalm, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, ye everlasting doors, and the king of glory shall come in." Or in the 47th Psalm: "God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet." What else is this than the resounding pæan of all the heavens, the "song of Moses and the Lamb," attuned to the evangelical text: "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the Prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me" (John xii. 31, 32). What less than the glowing picture of Christ's ascension, Eph. iv. 9, 10, given by the hand of St. Paul: "Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lowest parts of the earth"—took hold of the tottering universe in its deepest ground? "He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things." Then only might it be said: "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven. Thy faithfulness is unto all generations; thou hast established the earth and it abideth" (P. cxix. 89, 90).

This surely is what the same great apostle means, (Eph. i. 9, 10; Col. i. 16-20), by the "dispensation of the fulness of times," through which all things are to be gathered together under the headship of Christ, whether they be things on earth or things in heaven. He is thus the Alpha and Omega of all things, "the beginning of the creation of God" and its absolute

end; as he is plainly declared to be in the prologue of St. John's gospel. The Divine Logos, or Word, we are there told, was in the world before Christ came, not only as the principle of what we call the natural creation, but as the source also of life, which was at the same time light, true spiritual light, for men. But through the lapse of men from their first estate, they lost the power of seeing it. The light continued to shine, but it shined in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not. In these circumstances then, the Word, the one principle of all things as before, "was made flesh, and tabernacled among us," and we beheld his glory—the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; bringing forth judgment unto victory, and subduing forever all enemies under his feet.

"Of his fulness have all we received." The kingdom of God in the heavens; the kingdom of God on earth; the kingdom of God in every regenerate man; all proceed from the glorified Christ, and subsist in him perpetually as the one and sole principle of their universal life (Eph. i. 17–23; iii. 16–21; iv. 15, 16; Col. ii. 9, 10; John xv. 1–10). The Lord is in the angels, and the angels know themselves to be in him—their whole existence being in truth a constant outflowing of grace and truth from him, which they joyfully receive and make use of as his and not their own. This itself is heaven; not a local abode of any sort outside of the angels (for in that world space and time are not known as here); but a state of being, whose very substance is in and from the Lord forever. And so it is with the new life of every true believer here on earth, just so far as this new life has come to be in him as a spiritual reality different from his natural life. It is all from the Lord. He is only a vessel for its reception. The very organ by which this reception takes place, his faith as we call it, is not from himself, as we have before seen; but is in him as the gift of God, a capacity quickened into life by the vision of the Divine itself, in whose light it sees.

Thus it is that the new life in man is an image throughout of the life, by which our Lord, through conflict with the powers

of hell wrought out redemption for the world, and opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers. Our regeneration is a life process, answering to the movement of his life of humiliation on earth, from its birth of the virgin onward to its full glorification in heaven. Only with this grand distinction, that with him all was his own work, while with his followers all is brought to pass by his fulness thus achieved reaching into them continually in the way just shown. "Because I live," he says, "ye shall live also." His life absolute, his own arm brought salvation; he had power to lay down his life, and power to take it again. The life of his followers derivative only and dependent. "I am the vine, ye are the branches; without me, ye can do nothing."

No study in theology is more fruitful than this comparative view of the completion of Christ's Humanity and the birth and growth of the new man in our common humanity; his self-sanctification, and our sanctification from him through the truth vivified in his person. True, the mystery of the incarnation is far above our comprehension; but it mirrors itself nevertheless, for the spiritual eye, with a certain translucence, in the lower mystery; while this, then, again, helps greatly to bring the higher within the visual scope of faith. It is not easy to see, indeed, how any theology can amount to much whose observations are not taken constantly from this grand Christological height.

For here most certainly we have the true centre of Christianity, from which must be measured all its doctrines of faith and all its rules of life. Here only can they be seen and understood, as they are in themselves separately taken, and as they are also in their necessary order and wholeness; which is here seen at once to be determined and fixed forever in the Humanity of the Lord himself—that Divine tabernacle, the pattern of which is to be seen in this mount, and nowhere else. Here only can we feel ourselves to be in a world of spiritual actualities, where life reigns all around us and not death; where we have to do not with dreams and metaphysical abstractions, but with the

sure verities of God; where in one word, the everlasting *Nay*, as it has been called, of skepticism and doubt, is turned into the everlasting affirmative *Yea*, of the angels, shouting, "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

It would carry me far beyond the proper limits of this article, to follow out the subject of it in its relation to the manifold particulars that are embraced in the general use now mentioned. Leaving out of view then, for the present, other highly important applications, let it suffice here to fix attention upon one burning question of our time, the true solution of which, we may be very sure, is to be found only in the Christological idea as we have here been considering it. The question I mean is the *Inspiration of the Bible*.

It is easy to see that this is looming into view more and more from all sides as the decisive issue now of the general controversy between faith and unbelief. Have we a Written Word of God at all, to which recourse can be had with the certainty of a Divine response in matters of religion? If so, where is it, and how is it to be consulted; that it may not be for us, like the oracles of the heathen, a mere human voice in the end,—whether the voice of a mediating priesthood like that of Rome, or the voice of that greatest of all absurdities, each man's private judgment erecting itself into a standard for all other men,—and thus not a very *Thus saith the Lord* at all, coming down from heaven, and putting an end to doubt and debate. "To the law and to the testimony," says the prophet; "if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Is. viii. 20). That assuredly is the only rational sense of Divine inspiration. To be real and not imaginary, it must be self-attesting, self-interpreting, self-enforcing. Short of this, it can be no better than a juggle of vain words. That is just what it has been in fact largely with our traditional theology; and it is no doubt some uneasy feeling of this unpleasant fact, which will not allow our prevailing Christianity now to find rest in the old mechanical view of the doctrine, but

is continually urging it to seek after something broader and deeper. The misfortune is, however, that these tentative efforts, as the world now goes, are almost sure to end in a letting down of the whole subject from heaven to earth, making the last error to be worse than the first.

When we make the Word of God in the Bible the supreme sense of Christianity, we derogate nothing of course from what we have already seen to be the supremacy of the Divine Humanity of Jesus Christ in the same view. The two orders of revelation are in truth one. Neither could be real and full without the other. They are related as intimately as soul and body. Hence that pregnant article of the Holy Ghost in the Nicene Creed: "The Lord, the giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son, together is worshipped and glorified; who SPAKE BY THE PROPHETS." Which means, who is the perennial voice or inspiration of the Old Testament. To which answers then the declaration of the New Testament: God, who spake manifoldly in time past unto the fathers, hath in these last days SPOKEN UNTO US BY HIS SON—the brightness of his glory, the express image of his person, the creator and upholder of all worlds—who, having, by his work of redemption, recapitulated and gathered into one the universal sense of all things going before, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high (Heb. i. 1-3). The Old Testament speaking, thus, and the New Testament speaking, we may see, are not divided, but firmly and forever united; and this not outwardly, but inwardly; not mechanically, as with the joining of dead things, but most vitally by virtue of a common life. For it is the Giver of life, the outgoing breath of Jehovah, that speaks in the one case; and it is the Divine Human fountain of the Holy Ghost, the outgoing breath again of Jehovah, which speaks in the other case. Is it possible to conceive of the common inspiration of both Testaments under any stronger view than this? And is it possible, I ask again, to set in clearer light the organic relation of this common inspiration to the actual glorified life of the Lord?

We are brought thus to the true touch-stone or test of inspiration. In the midst of all conflicting schemes and theories, the Bible itself shuts us up to this as being its inmost essence, namely, Christ himself in the Word, both as the wisdom of God and the power of God unto salvation. Not merely with the Word externally, or above it, by the separate action of his Spirit, but in the very bosom of the Word as its actual spirit and life. A hard saying, exclaims the natural mind; who can hear it? But have we not his own witness for it, in the direct face of that unbelieving question: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life" (John vi. 63)? It is sorry subterfuge to limit this to what goes before in the same chapter. It refers to his words universally. All words going out from him, the absolute life and truth, must be of this character—must be by that fact itself supernatural and inspired words. And how then can it be otherwise with the words he spake in time past by the prophets, through the Holy Ghost, the Giver of life? Inspiration means such life to start with; but if so, it means also such life abiding with it through all following time. For example, the life which was breathed into the Ten Commandments when they were first spoken from mount Sinai, must be in them to this day if they are still inspired. In no other view can they be said to be the word of God which *liveth* and abideth forever. We might as well talk of the stars being settled in heaven, without having in them still the life of the word which first spake them into being.

Much of the debate we have at the present time concerning inspiration becomes here of no account. The question especially between verbalism and what we may call realism falls to the ground; because both these theories rest on a lower plane altogether than that of the high Christological truth now before us, and both alike therefore, in its presence, come under what is substantially the same condemnation. They give us on both sides what is at best, by their own confession, but a natural inspiration instead of a spiritual inspiration; a providential leading of ordinary human thought and speech, in difference from the actual descent of the Divine itself into such human thought

and speech. In this view both violate the inward sanctity of the Word of God, by turning it into a Word of man. Verbalism stiffens thus into mechanical bondage; while realism evaporates into latitudinarian freedom, losing itself at last in broad open rationalism.

The ground maxim of all this wrong manner of looking at the Word of God, as we know, rests in the assumption that if God speaks to men in the way of revelation at all, it must be in a form intelligible to men; which is taken at once to mean in the form of common human thought in common human speech. It is admitted that the Bible has to do ultimately with things and thoughts which transcend all human apprehension, as Isaiah and Paul so strongly teach; heavenly realities, which must be considered then the true inward sense of the Bible, the divine side of it in distinction from its human side in the historical letter of it. But when it is asked, how we are to come into communication with this inward sense, the only answer is, that it can be solely by the operation of God's Spirit, outside of the Bible, acting on our minds and enabling us to turn its natural sense to some spiritual use. That is, what God for man's accommodation first lets down to the plane of ordinary human thought, man by Divine assistance, must raise again to its native heavenly plane, that it may be for him really and truly the Word of God.

We have the case well put in one of the finest passages of the Westminster Confession of Faith, as follows:

"The authority of the holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the word of God. We may be moved by the testimony of the church to a high and reverent concern of the holy scripture; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation,

the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God; yet, notwithstanding our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts."

This is beautiful and grand; and over against the reigning rationalistic tendency of our age, deserves to be written in letters of gold. No terms could better set forth the predicates of the merely human side of divine revelation, or better express their legitimate force; while at the same time it is declared with unfaltering faith, that apart from the divine side of it they are of no force whatever to make this either intelligible or really present to the human mind.

But just there the oracle slides into an uncertain sound; as the Reformation doctrine of the *testimony of the Holy Ghost*, according to Dr. Dorner, had a tendency always to do from the beginning. The testimony is made external to the word, instead of being lodged in its very bosom; it is made to be "by and *with* it in our hearts," instead of by and *in* it there. It is torn from its objective seat in the word, where our Saviour expressly places it (John xiv. 15-17, 23, 26; xv. 9, 10; xvi. 13-15), and relegated to the unstable domain of our common human subjectivity; leaving the word, thus forsaken of its own true life, to become like a ship driven without rudder, at the mercy of every Montanistic wind of doctrine, from whatever quarter it may chance to blow.

There is, of course, an outward and an inward, in other words, what we may call letter and spirit, in the human side of revelation, apart from the divine, as with all speech of men. There is voice, outward word and letter, to begin with, and within this there is thought and fact to end with; and very many persons seem to think that what St. Paul says of the letter that killeth and the spirit which maketh alive regards only this distinction. But the Westminster Confession soars high above all that. Not only the historical and grammatical

body of the Bible, but all that lies within that in the way of natural experience, knowledge, or reflection, are here taken collectively for its human side; the outward form and vesture of its divine side, its true inward and supernatural sense, by which only it can be said to be alive, and to have in it the power of God unto salvation. That sense the Confession finds rightly in the abiding operation of God's Spirit. It stops short of the full truth, only by not identifying the Spirit with the Word, so as to make its inward sense the very voice of the Spirit there, breathing through its outward sense. That is the way the Bible itself speaks of its own oracles. They are oracles of God; not dead, but living; not dumb, but as the voice of seven thunders sounding from heaven. Such only is the miraculous constitution of the Bible, by which, in boundless difference from all worldly philosophy and science, it is found to be a real medium of communication between men on earth and angels in heaven, bringing all together as one new creation in Christ Jesus.

The Spirit thus in the Word is no other than Christ himself. He, therefore, is the one universal sense of the Word, its inward life and soul. He is not in it partially only, here and there, nor occasionally only, now and then. He is not in it in any secondary view, as the reflection merely of some different primary object, or system of objects, on the mundane side. He is there as the inmost whole of the entire revelation. To that we are absolutely shut up by the force of the Christological idea itself. Other things may be the shadow of him, he can never be their shadow. What follows from this? The inspiration of the Word has nothing to do with its mundane aspects—historical, ritualistic, pictorial, or simply scientific in any view—on their own account; but looks through these always and wholly to Christ, and the spiritual world in him, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all. Is he not in his Divine Humanity the sum total of all revelation? How then can we talk or think of a Word of God, revealing the mind and will of God, and not believe him to be in it as its living principle at every point? Nothing less than

that, indeed, is to be understood by what he himself says of his coming into the world, that it was to "fulfil all things written concerning him in the law of Moses, and in the prophets and in the psalms." For most assuredly this fulfilling was not to be of some grains of truth only, hid away here and there in bushels of chaff; and then also perhaps through such strained constructions of the natural sense as we find applied to the text, *Out of Egypt have I called my Son*, and other like examples. It could be nothing less than the internal spiritual meaning of the law, the psalms and the prophets, in their wholeness (as this had been in them from the beginning), now emerging from them, and disclosing what it had been all along, in his own actual advent as the living Messiah, the only true God manifest in the flesh.

Let it be well noted, that what is here said of inspiration regards it in that eminent character which belongs to it as the source of God's Word strictly so called. The common view of it, as we have seen, places it on lower ground, by reducing it to a providential superintendence simply of its human organs, guarding them from error, more or less, in the free use of their natural powers. There is room to conceive of such providential guidance; and in this way there may be room to distinguish also, as many do, between higher and lower degrees of inspiration in different parts of our canonical Bible. But with all that I have nothing to do in this article. Such lower scripture can be thought of as capable of good use; but only under the presiding auspices of a body of real divine revelation in the higher form. And it is wholly with such higher form the present article is concerned. And with that, moreover, in the idea of the subject, rather than with its practical exhibition. For the idea here is the main thing, and must be clear to us, before we can be prepared at all to do any sort of justice to the actual realization of it in the Bible. What we need to be sure about first of all is, What does GOD'S WORD, as inspired in the high sense, mean? Then, have we any such Word, first in the Old Testament, and then in the New? These questions

once resolved for our faith, we may go on to ask after the law and the testimony with good prospect of success. Otherwise we may be very sure there will be no light in us.

The distinguished Professor W. Robertson Smith, of Scotland, in his late ingenious work, "Lectures on the Old Testament," has much to say of the human side of the Bible. "We hear many speak of the human side of the Bible," he tells us, "as if there were something dangerous about it, as if it ought to be kept out of sight lest it taught us to forget that the Bible is the Word of God. And there is a widespread feeling that though the Bible no doubt has a human side, a safe and edifying exegesis must confine itself to the divine side." This, however, he holds to be thoroughly unprotestant and unevangelical. "The first condition of a sound understanding of scripture," he goes on to say, "is to give full recognition to the human side, to master the whole position and character and feelings of each human interlocutor who has a part in the drama of revelation. Nay, the whole business of scholarly exegesis lies with this human side." Then again: "We must not be afraid of the human side of scripture. It is from that side alone that scholarship can get at any biblical question." And so then: "In this department of intellectual life, science and faith have joined hands. There is no discordance between the religious and the scholarly methods of study. They lead to the same goal; and the more closely our study fulfils the demands of historical scholarship, the more fully will it correspond with our religious needs." In all this the writer is careful to assure us that he does not deny the possibility of the supernatural, that he is no rationalist in any bad sense; but still reminds us, on the other hand, "that all truth is one, that God who gave us the Bible has also given us faculties of reason and gifts of scholarship with which to study the Bible, and that the true meaning of scripture is not to be measured by preconceived notions, but determined as the result of legitimate research."

Plausible, but none the less fallacious. A minimum of truth borne down by a maximum of most serious error.

To begin with the last point quoted. Professor Smith, in appealing to reason as a judge of truth, loses sight altogether of the psychological distinction, between reason in its lower merely natural form and the same power in its higher spiritual form. In the first form it is the rational organism set in motion by mere earthly knowledges from below itself, preparing the way merely for its full free exercise in its higher second form; where it is met from above with its true spiritual life flowing into it from the Lord. It is the same faculty throughout; only in its first state it is drawn toward the earth, while in the second it is drawn toward heaven. Our true rationality comes with this opening toward the divine; and is nothing less in fact than the light of heaven, shining into our souls obscurely through the outward truths of God's Word. Reason in such form is indeed a true and faithful witness to divine revelation, lending evidence even to its deepest mysteries. But in its lower form, having in it no light but that of nature, which is darkness rather than light, it can never be other than an ignis fatuus, leading men away from the *One Truth* of God (which is Jesus Christ), and never toward it in any degree.

And what is thus true of the natural reason, of men holds good also of those "gifts of scholarship," of which Professor Smith speaks as joining with reason to make up on the human side the testimony of this one truth, in co-operation as it were with the testimony of God's Spirit on the divine side. The gifts he means are knowledges, sciences, learning of all sorts, gathered from the natural side of our life—the side of it which opens toward the world of time and sense, in difference from the side of it which opens toward the world of things unseen and eternal. These are all important for heavenly uses; but only again as elements to be taken up into the constitution of heavenly truths derived from revelation, and never in the least degree as co-ordinate forces, working before them, or outside of them, in any independent view.

Altogether, Professor Smith's apology for the human side of scripture, over against its divine side, proceeds throughout on

the view that these two factors do in fact work asunder in bringing divine revelation to pass; and that the relation between them is indeed one of strict co-ordination, with equal rights on both sides. But this at once destroys the whole idea of organic unity in the Word of God, and retains only the poorest semblance of it by giving foremost place to the human factor, and turning the divine factor then into a gnostic vision. And thus we have the inexorable consequence of all gnosticism, the expulsion of the divine wholly out from the mystery to which it rightfully belongs and the reduction of the mystery thus to flat humanitarianism.

There is something almost amusing in the naivete with which our scholarly Scotch Professor finds himself driven to the confession of this lame conclusion, without seeming to see at all how it upsets the whole idea of Divine Inspiration—God's Word having the breath of the Almighty *IN IT*, and not on the outside of it in man's breath. After throwing the entire weight of what the Scriptures are as a divine revelation in their exterior historical and grammatical structure, he lets us know, to bolster up our timid faith, that we have still a sure word of prophecy here to which it is well for us to take heed as to a light shining in the dark. He is no rationalist; he believes in the supernatural. But when we cry out *Where?* and *How?* alas, for the unsatisfying response. "Only of this I am sure at the outset, that the Bible does speak to the heart of man in words that can only come from God—that no historical research can deprive me of this conviction, or make less precious the divine utterances that speak straight to the heart. For the language of these words is so clear, that no readjustment of their historical setting can conceivably change the substance of them. Historical study may throw a new light on the circumstances in which they were first heard or written. In that there can be only gain. But the plain, central, heart-felt truths that speak for themselves and rest on their own indefeasible worth will assuredly remain to us."

That sounds well; and bears witness to the educational piety

of the writer, as being something deeper than the stratification of German rationalism with which it has been unhappily overlaid. But it is incongruous with his own theory of criticism and hermeneutics; and involves at bottom just that view of inspiration which it has been the object of this article to enforce, and which his theory disowns. He sunders the understanding of truth in the Word from its necessary complement, the new will-power by which only divine truth can live and so be really truth at all; and then thinks of this will-power (the affection of the heart) as an abstract gift of the Holy Ghost reaching the believer from the outside, whereas, in fact, both these divine gifts, light in the understanding and love in the heart (the new spirit and the new will) are born in us together, the new will being the soul of the new understanding, and both alike, as the Bible plainly declares, through the word of God only "which liveth and abideth forever."

ARTICLE II.—THE LIFE OF OUR LORD, AS PRESENTED IN
THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

BY REV. CHR. VANDER VEEN.

No part of the sacred record has had an ampler vindication in our day than the fourth gospel. No part deserves it better. Of the four gospels, we can spare it least. Among the books of the New Testament, it is, to say the least, unique, and, in a certain sense, fundamental. The modern attacks upon it were, in every way, wanton. The historic doubts suggested against its external credentials would have been considered contemptible by critics, if presented in the case of any profane writing. The internal difficulties could only be made to assume importance by ignoring the ordinary principles admitted in biography, the value of biography depending upon the degree of intimacy

between the biographer and his subject. The spirit and design displayed in the attack were cruel. No figure in history occupies a place of so great, so direct influence as Jesus of Nazareth. His words have furnished men with noblest aims; His life has been their inspiration. Nor is there any evidence that the influence of that life will be diminished. To the very extent that our world in civilization and Christianity experiences the effect of that matchless life in Palestine, He who lived it becomes indispensable to the love, the faith and the hope of humanity. To desire to attack the record which gives us the deepest insight into that life, to set to work deliberately to rob humanity of its most essential light, should be the very last aim which men who love their struggling fellow-men would seek. If the unsought discovery of an overwhelming adverse testimony bade us give up so needed knowledge as this brief memoir furnishes, well might the talent of this world come together to weep over the loss and consult how it might be recompensed. Needlessly to alarm human confidence in it, is a crime against men, no less than against God.

In this case, the attack has been defeated, and indirectly it has been of great benefit. It has given a new opportunity to state the solid grounds upon which the Church holds this invaluable testimony concerning Jesus Christ. Never were these grounds presented so thoroughly as in the apologetic writings of our time, which have thus been drawn out from the ablest scholars in every land. It has afforded new occasion to justify the convictions of the Church concerning Jesus Christ as needful to the world, and of her peculiar duty to bring Christ and humanity together. It has renewed the appreciation of this gospel, and greatly increased the desire to understand its contents better.

The design of this paper is to help somewhat in this last-mentioned direction, by investigating what peculiar light this gospel casts upon the life of our Lord while among us.

The matter of the fourth gospel is almost entirely new. Besides the narrative of the events of the last week of the Lord's

life—an essential part of any gospel—it has, in common with the Synoptists, only the story of the miraculous feeding of the five thousand, and of the walking on the water, following that great exhibition of sympathy and power. Hence it is now generally known as the complementary gospel.

This peculiarity does not necessarily imply a different view of the Lord's life from that which the Synoptists present. It might simply mean, in the strict sense of complement, a fuller presentation of the events of that life; either in the form of a larger, more correct version of the events narrated by the Synoptists, or in the form of additional matter. To a certain extent, it does mean this. In the narrative which covers the important last week of the Lord's life, we have, *e. g.*, a fuller version of its incidents, as well as of its discourses. To specify: John fixes more accurately the chronology of that period. xi. 55; xii. 1, 12; xiii. 1, 2. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 2, 6; Mark xiv. 1, 3, 12. He gives the final testimony of the Father at the visit of the Greeks. xii. 28. We owe to John the knowledge that the woman who anointed the Lord at Bethany was Mary, the sister of Lazarus. xi. 2; xii. 3. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 7; Mark xiv. 3. He tells us of the significant washing of the disciples' feet. xiii. 4. He brings out the entire voluntariness of the surrender of Jesus to His final capture. xviii. 6. Also the explanation of the fact that Jesus was not finally put to death by the immediate power of the Jews, who had so long sought His life. xviii. 31. The fuller conversation with Pilate (xviii. 33-37); the fuller account of Jewish fanaticism against Jesus (xix. 4-16); and of the final indignities heaped upon the Lord, we owe to this writer. The dispute about the title affixed to the cross (xix. 19-22); the division of the garments (23, 24); the parting of the Mother and the crucified Son (25-27); the complete words on the cross (28-30); the legal evidence of His death (32-37); the part of Nicodemus in the burial (39); as well as the fuller report of the Lord's resurrection (xx. 3-18); and of His subsequent appearances (xx. 24-xxi. 24), have come to us through John's pen.

So, also, the body of the gospel contains additional matter, covering periods of the Lord's life of which evidently this apostle alone had personal knowledge.

From a survey of the gospel, the claim of a more intimate relation between the Lord and this disciple (xiii. 23) can readily be believed. Hence he may well have had a fuller knowledge of the Lord's life, either by a personal acquaintance with many occasions, when he was the only chosen witness to important incidents in that life, or by an intimate knowledge of events and words confided to him by the Lord during private conversations in their particular intercourse. Very probably he obtained his knowledge in both of these ways. It is quite possible, for instance, as suggested by Dr. Sears, that in those visits of the Lord to Jerusalem, which form the subject of so large a portion of this gospel, John was the Lord's only traveling companion. Conversations like those held with Nicodemus and the woman of Samaria, at which no witnesses were present, he could have learned only from the Lord Himself. The character of the truths made known upon those two occasions precludes the idea that the Lord communicated them to all the disciples. Mark, *e. g.*, the revelation of salvation by faith in the *crucified* Son of God to Nicodemus. iii. 14, 15, compared with Matt. xvi. 21-26. Also, of His Messianic character and the abolition of the distinction between the Jews and the Gentiles to the Samaritan woman. iv. 26, 21-24, compared with Matt. xvi. 16, 17; x. 5, 6; xv. 24.

Admitting, then, a more intimate acquaintance with the Lord than the other Evangelists had, we may expect both additional particulars of that life and a deeper view of its character and meaning.

Of the first we have already given some evidence. John wrote last of the Evangelists, and undoubtedly with the other gospels before him. His silence as to the Galilean ministry, as recorded by the Synoptists, and of which he also had been an eye-witness, is the confirmation of their story. His narrative of the Judean ministry is new. Upon this field we shall now in brief outline :

I. What additional knowledge of the Lord's life John gives; and then,

II. That he gives us a deeper view of the character of the person, whose life he briefly sketches in its characteristics rather than in its details.

I. The scene of this gospel is almost exclusively laid at Jerusalem and its surroundings. It details the occurrences there at those different periods of the Lord's life when He visited the sacred city to celebrate the appointed feasts. A brief outline of the events and the probable time occupied is here given.

The gospel opens with a preliminary description of the Lord's pre-existent life, and with a brief account of John the Baptist's mission and his work, especially as related to the Lord's life. i. 1-28.

We then have, in the human life of the Lord proper, one day, on which the Lord received the direct testimony of the Baptist as the Lamb of God and the Son of God. i. 29-34.

Then another day, on which the Lord received three disciples, and increase of testimony that He is the Lamb of God and the Messiah. 35-42.

Then another day, on which the Lord received two disciples, and from them more testimony that He is the Prophesied One, the Son of God and Israel's King. 43-51.

Then the departure into Galilee (two days) and the account of a visit (third day) to Cana, where the Lord attended a wedding and wrought His first miracle. After which He stays in Capernaum for a few days. ii. 1-12.

After this we have a visit to Jerusalem at the Passover. Here the Lord purified the temple, by which He aroused the antagonism of the spiritual rulers; and by His repeated miracles drew the admiration of many persons to Himself. 13-25.

Of one of the most prominent among these, Nicodemus, an account is given in a conversation which the Lord held with him during one evening. iii. 1-21.

Then follows the departure of the Lord into the Judean

country, where He remained for some months preaching and baptizing in the neighborhood of the Baptist's station. 22-24.

The increased opposition of the ruling classes of the Jews causes the Lord to leave Judea for Galilee. We then have an account of His visit by the way to Samaria, where He staid two days. Reaching Galilee, this gospel narrates the second miracle at Cana. iii. 25—iv. 54.

John is then silent concerning the Lord's life until the feast of chapter v., presumably the next Passover, when he narrates the first formal ecclesiastical decree against the Lord, v. 16, consequent upon His healing an impotent man at the pool of Bethesda upon the Sabbath. v. 1-47.

Again silence for nearly a year. About the time of the next Passover, this gospel tells us of the Lord in the Transjordanic country feeding the multitudes, and instructing them concerning His claims as the bread from heaven—the Father's great gift unto eternal life; and in this connection we have the first great falling away among His followers, Peter's decided acknowledgment of His claims and character, and the first prediction of Judas' treachery. vi. 1-71.

Next we have the visit to Jerusalem at the feast of Tabernacles, with its important self-testifyings, and the first attempt of the Sanhedrin to arrest Him, and a subsequent attempt to stone Him. The whole probably not covering more than a week's time. vii—x. 21.

Then comes the visit to Jerusalem at the feast of Dedication, when the Lord reiterated His self-testifyings of the previous occasion, and the rulers again sought to arrest Him. x. 22-39.

It is then related that the Lord withdrew into retirement a little way from the capital, where He remains—coming forth once to raise Lazarus—until the next Passover, when the attempt upon His life is finally successful. x. 40—xi. 57.

These events are all new, when we compare this record with that of the Synoptic gospels. The whole amount of time covered by them is brief. The important discourses cover only

the space of a few hours. Of the longest continuous period preserved in this gospel—that of the Lord's official work in Judea, extending over a space of perhaps eight months—the record is very scant, the important occurrence in it being a dispute between one of the Lord's disciples and some of the Baptist's, and some words of the Baptist occasioned by this controversy. iii. 25–36.

II. Reading this epitome, one might say it is a collection of fragments. It furnishes, however, a complete picture, a beautiful mosaic, distinct from the regularly pencilled portrait which the Synoptists combine to draw, and yet recognizable as the same subject from a different point of view. The general difference is easily indicated. All the gospels were written during that period, when the Christian Church had an overwhelming sense that "Jesus Christ had been declared to be the Son of God," by the resurrection from the dead; and were written by men who so believed in Him and preached Him as seated at the right hand of God, the source of life, pardon and holiness. The Synoptic gospels prove Him to be rightly associated with human hopes as the object of faith, by connecting Him in a true human life with human experiences of sin and want and suffering. Men, who had gone out toward the Divine Christ in heaven, were thus led to a blessed sense of that Christ's oneness with them through His true humanity. John wrote when possibly the first fervor of this Christ-worship was passing away, when this great truth of the Sonship was being assailed, when men began to profess to see in Him little more than a superior human being, the greatest of the prophets. He established the original truth that Jesus is the Son of God. Neither, however, does so present his view of our Lord as to exclude that of the other. We may say the Synoptists connect the divine Christ, whom men worshipped, with the human Jesus whom they loved; John connects the Jesus, whom men praised, with the Christ in whom they were to believe. Both do this in such a way as never to separate the divine and the human in the One Person, whom both describe. It would not,

therefore, be just to say that the fourth gospel gives us a different view of that life, which is more particularly set forth in the record of the Synoptists, but only a fuller and deeper view of it.

Even without the fourth gospel there can be as little doubt, from the record, of the divine in Jesus of Nazareth, as of the human, though the latter is specially proved in His manifold relations to humanity in its being, experiences, wants, hopes, and aspirations. So also there can be no uncertainty as to the true union of these two elements in that One Person who, in the Synoptic gospels so often furnishes evidence of both at the same time. Witness the scenes in the temple (Luke ii. 41-52), at the Baptism (Matt. iii. 13-17 and parallels), in the temptation (Matt. iv. 1-11 and parallels); and perhaps still more strikingly in many of the miracles which seem to be called forth by His human sympathy, as, the raising of the widow's son (Luke vii. 11-17); or which increase the consciousness of His human limitations, as the healing of the woman with a bloody flux (Luke viii. 43-48; Mark v. 25-34); or which make prominent the human weakness, as the stilling of the tempest which comes upon the unconscious Lord (Luke viii. 23-25; Mark iv. 37-41; Matt. viii. 24-26), and the casting out of the dumb demon, which the Lord must needs connect with His own fasting and prayer (Matt. xvii. 19-21; Mark ix. 28-29).

There is nothing essentially different from such divine-human representations of the Lord's life in the fourth gospel; they are multiplied and set forth in an even bolder relief.

1. *As to the thoroughly human character of that life and its relations to the life, experiences, and environments of humanity*, this gospel furnishes proofs of a very striking kind. For example: The man, whose first knowledge of Jesus, received from his great Master, was as the Lamb of God, tells us most artlessly of the human surroundings where he had his first interview with his Greater Master (i. 39). He preserves for us the evidences of the continuance of the Lord's relations to His

kindred during His ministry, up to the very moment of His death (ii. 12; vii. 3-5; 8-10; xix. 26. Comp. Matt. xii. 46-50; Mark iii. 31-35; Luke viii. 19-21). He tells us of the participation of the Lord in the festivities of humanity, sanctifying and guarding human joys at the wedding in Cana (ii. 1-10); and at the same time of the Lord's acknowledgment of the social claims of men upon His presence in such scenes. He gives the instances of the Lord's obligatory attendance upon the religious ordinances instituted by Moses, even at the risk of personal danger; and it is he who gives us the sufficient excuse when the Lord omits their observance. (vii. 1). In his gospel we have the most numerous and definite instances of the Lord's physical infirmities, as shown by weariness, hunger and thirst. Though the record covers but a few detached brief periods, and these generally the seasons of relaxation and religious enjoyment and enthusiasm to the people, it is full of His human suffering, labors, anxieties, perils, responsibilities, and sympathies. Somehow, amid the general joy of the feasts, He is able to find the wretched: the cripple at Bethesda's pool (v. 1) and the blind man by the wayside. (ix. 1). In this gospel we have the most touching evidence of the Lord's deep sense of suffering in others (xi. 35), and His farthest accompaniment of humanity into the realm of death at the grave of Lazarus.

If in a true gospel there be required only proofs of the Lord's true humanity, and of the value of His human life to humanity as helpful, hopeful, guiding and inspiring, we have them here. Or if these be not deemed sufficient, this gospel furnishes more abundant evidence in the manifold testimonies of His enemies, intended by them to have legal weight, and which deny to Him any other attributes than those of humanity. It is worth our while to pay a moment's attention to this. It is in the Synoptists that we find the record of a quite extensive system of espionage, carried on under the instruction and supervision of the Sanhedrin, begun in Judea and followed up in that part of the country, where the Lord spent the greater

part of His official life. We have in this gospel the conclusions to which these men came after watching Him for long periods. To their eyes, trained only to see the natural and understand only the earthly in its lowest sense, this lower existence so predominates in this life of Jesus, that there is, in their view, no room in it for the high claims which He emphasizes whenever He appears in Jerusalem. They summarize the results of their close and continued investigation thus: "For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God." (x. 33.)

So Jesus is, upon the more limited field presented in this gospel, as truly human, as in the wider and more homely scenes of the Synoptic gospels, and we have here also the biography of a brother man.

2. But we have more. We have, if possible, a clearer bringing out, in this gospel, of the intimate union between the divine and the human life in our Lord, and this in a peculiar way. In the Synoptists, the writers bear witness to this tremendous fact. They hear, they see, they deduce, they confess, they endeavor to persuade and make us share their convictions of this wonderful character of their Master. To different classes and by different lines of argument, each one substantiates this claim as witness-bearers for Him. But in this gospel the chief thing is the testimony of the Lord Himself concerning this complex life. The presentation of that life by John is much more the record of the Lord's consciousness expressed by Himself, and simply transmitted by the disciple, than the testimony of this intimate follower to his own impressions. These also are indeed clear and sufficiently abundant, but they are so little prominent that commentators find no more promising subject of dispute in this gospel than the question, Which of these words are John's and which are the Lord's? In the Synoptists how little Jesus talks about Himself! His chief discourses are concerning the kingdom of heaven. In John, how much about Himself! What a wide range of self-interpretation and self-testifying there is allowed to the Lord! The gospel is almost

wholly made up of self-revealings through conversations and discussions, and they are revealings of this complex character and life of Himself. For example: To Nathanael it is: "Ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." i. 51. To the Jews, upon the first occasion: "Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise;" "Destroy this temple"—it was then destructible—"and in three days I will raise it up." ii. 16, 19. To Nicodemus: "We speak that we do know and testify that we have seen;" "The Son of man is in heaven;" "God hath sent His only-begotten Son." iii. 11, 13, 16, 17. To the woman of Samaria: "I am thirsty and I have living water. I am the Christ, the Saviour of the world." iv. 7, 10, 42. To Mary and Martha: "I am the resurrection and the life." xi. 25. To the disciples and to the Jews alike, the Lord invariably, in this gospel, tells what He thinks of Himself, reveals who He is, and how and why He is among men; that is, He interprets His life in its significance to them Himself.

It is the prominence given in this gospel to the Lord's *constant* consciousness of His twofold character, which, on the one hand, makes the contrast between the two characters sharper, and, on the other hand, blends them more markedly into one wonderful personality. Take, for example, the wedding in Cana. How sharp the contrast! The Lord is invited upon simply human grounds, like His mother and disciples, as a guest whom it will not do to neglect. He is involved in the embarrassment arising from a meagre provision for the feast. He is under the influence of a mother's appeal, in an unpleasant emergency, to a son who knows more than she. Out of that human life so environed by earthly considerations springs forth the first manifestation of glory which appeals to faith. How easily the guest becomes a divine Master, a wonderful host!

So at Jacob's well. What a contrast between that weary traveler, dust-covered and thirsty, bringing his wants to a woman, and the Christ of God communicating eternal life; but how marvelous the identity of the two!

So at the grave of Lazarus. What a contrast between the weeping friend and the vivifying Lord, but how close their relationship! In all such scenes it is impossible to get rid of a sense of complexity in that life, but still more impossible to deny the wonderful oneness which demands faith in the person who is at the same time so near to both God and man.

Much stress has been laid by some upon the idea that John's gospel mainly presents that life as the object of Jewish hatred and fanaticism, but we find that the Synoptists bring out this fact with no less distinctness and fulness. (See Matt. xii. 14; Mark iii. 6; Luke vi. 11.) John, however, brings this to bear on the fact of His personality, which is the main occasion for this impatient antagonism of the Jews, and which shows itself nowhere more plainly than in the moments of personal danger, threatening a life indestructible indeed, because it has its roots more in heaven and eternity than in the earth and time.

And thus we come to the special value of this gospel, in our estimates of this human life. In the Synoptists, we have but seldom this self-evident appearing of the Lord as greater than the Prophets. He brings messages from God and works miracles, but so did the prophets before Him. If He bring more important messages, and perform more and greater miracles, it is simply a proof that He is a greater prophet than those who came before Him; but these are not indisputably the proof that He stands in an essentially different relation to God. It is true, we have the indispensable self-testifying of this different relation in them, but they are infrequent. (Matt. xi. 26-30; xvi. 24-28, and parallels.) In John, however, the indwelling of the divine in the human is uniform and constant. The Lord's life, according to the fourth gospel, is distinctively a divine-human life; that is, a human life in all its testimony distinctly conscious of its higher relations to God, as well as of its essential relations to man.

3. Again, according to this gospel, *the human life of the Lord is a life conscious of its place in the world of men as God's special gift to that world.* It presents us the Lord as always

conscious of His mission and of the intended effect of His complex life upon the character, conduct, and destiny of men in the widest sense. It is no life for show, but for effect. Hence the manifold words out of that life—promises, to which, in this gospel, the recital of the works is always subordinate.

We may well dwell a little longer upon this. The view which the Synoptists give of the connection between Christ and men in their wants, partakes of that which was most prominent to the Jews in the Old Testament dispensation. That of the help of God vouchsafed in limited areas of time and space; contact with individuals, under specific conditions, for particular objects. Hence we find in them a record of detached miracles, almost entirely within the limits of the covenant people, to whom, as Peter said, God first sent His Son Jesus. So also with the words preserved. These almost exclusively pertain to the new dispensation, as contrasted with the old, showing indeed the widening of the sphere, but not indicating the width to which it would attain. Nearly all the words preserved in the Synoptists may be classed under the Parables and the Sermon on the Mount. The sphere of the parables as a mode of instruction, is indicated by the Lord Himself in His reply to the disciples, asking Him why He chose this method of discourse. The Sermon on the Mount pertains entirely within the kingdom of heaven. It is antithetical to the legislation on Sinai; and in it the Lord speaks not in the complete character of a prophet, but in the special character of a lawgiver. The occasional words which testify of a wider import are, according to the Synoptists, addressed to the select circle of the apostles. But even to them their significance is not explained. The most pregnant word of the Lord, preserved by the Synoptists, was that priestly-prophetic word which we find twice repeated by them: "The Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of men, and they shall kill Him, and the third day He shall be raised again." (Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 22; xx. 17, and parallels.) But no direct object was stated, and it was not apparently connected with the hopes of men, but only with their fears and

distresses. This became evident in the severe remonstrance of Peter at its first announcement, and in the terror of nearly all the disciples, when that word began to be fulfilled.

The fourth gospel, on the other hand, gives us Christ as not only endowed with "powers," to effectually counteract specific evils, but as being, in His whole divine-human person, the antidote to evil, the supply of want. The words of the Lord preserved in this gospel, bear principally upon this relation: "I give living water. I am the bread of life. I am the light. I am the door. I am the way, the truth, and the life. I am the Good Shepherd. I am the Resurrection." And this relation is upon the widest scale, the cosmical. "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved." iii. 17. "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." vi. 51. "I am the light of the world." viii. 12. "I came a light into the world . . . not to judge the world, but to save the world." xii. 46, 47.

The works recorded in this gospel simply illustrate these words; and the enmity of the Jews, preserved in this book especially, and presented as based upon this assertion of Christ's attributes and His relations to humanity, indirectly verifies them; while it is, at the same time, condemned as foolish and wicked, because it is not merely an assault upon the person Jesus, but on men's needs, as well as on God's love.

4. Finally, this gospel represents *the human life of the Lord as the background for the divine*. In the mouth of the Lord, the favorite name used in Galilee—Son of man—does not indeed lose its significance, yet is here constantly subordinated to the loftier designation, the Son; and sometimes to the plain term, Son of God, which is new to this gospel. So the earthly relations are subordinated to the first, greatest, and most potent relation expressed in the term, My Father. To whatever extent the Synoptists may justify a conception of the incarnation as a virtual, though temporary, surrender of His divine attributes by our Lord, the fourth gospel proves that a con-

sciousness of His indefeasible right to the divine glory was ever with Him. Yea, the manifestation of that glory gradually assumed its legitimate place in His fleshly existence. As the human life develops in weakness and suffering, the promise, value and glory of the divine come out more fully, more distinctly, more convincingly. So that, in the completed human life of Jesus, we see first and principally the glory of the Lord, and find it constantly more easy and befitting to adore and to believe. It is impossible to deny that the gospel as a whole answers the design which this Evangelist himself announced thus: "These are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that, believing, ye might have life in His name." But by this, this human life is by no means detached from the life of humanity; rather is it the more closely related to it. Nowhere are the ties between this life and the world more strenuously insisted upon than here. In this gospel the human life of our Elder Brother receives its highest meaning and most promising significance to the world, as the manifestation of the Father in Him to the world. (See v. 19, 23, 30, 43; vi. 27, 32, 33; x. 32, 36-38.)

Could the Lord have had a more competent scribe to pen what may not unaptly be called an autobiography? To present this peculiar phase of that wonderful life needed four qualifications, which can be found combined only in John.

1. It required an intimacy with Jesus which gave access to every part of His active life during His brief ministry; and still more, which opened up to him the sacred recesses of the secret life of Christ: His thoughts, desires, aspirations, sympathies; His loves, and hopes, and anticipations; His aims, and persuasions, and beliefs. No man could have written this story, who had not seen Jesus under all possible circumstances; who had not heard the utterances of that Soul in all its possible relations to this many-sided human world.

2. It demanded a singular degree of mental and spiritual correspondence between the author and his great subject. The Synoptic gospels, bearing more the character of chronicles: the

recital of striking acts and occurrences, the record of the more important set discourses, require principally a reportorial accuracy, which it is not difficult to attain, and in which one can be easily assisted by the testimony of fellow-witnesses,—whence the rather remarkable agreement of these three independent narratives is easily enough explained without either the theory of collusion or of mechanical inspiration. The greater part of the fourth gospel, however, is a record of words spoken in familiar converse, or under highly exciting circumstances of antagonism and controversy, and sometimes of personal danger,—which also could not be verified by friendly witnesses. They uniformly also touched a range of subjects altogether new and strange, introduced new terms, strange relations and unknown views of God and of the world. John had no training, except that of intimate intercourse with His Master, to help him, but this was evidently so large, so powerful, as to cast his mind in the mold of his Lord's, and thus to make him his Master's most intelligent interpreter, as well as most faithful amanuensis.

3. Before he could give the record to the world, however, he needed a completer understanding of those wonderful doings and words than he could obtain during his tutelage. Then only would he be fully fit to transmit the Lord's words, when he could speak like words from like experiences. When, having done the "greater works," as the Master promised, he was able to tell men the full significance of the Lord's manifestations; when, being led into all the truth, he could intelligently communicate the truths which the Lord had entrusted to him: then he could be an Evangelist, as well as an Apostle. Until then he had that wonderful patience which the saints possess. How often must his heart have burned within him to put on parchment the marvellous words which he had so long treasured in his bosom, or occasionally told to a trusted and believing circle of brethren! But he restrained himself until he had seen the life of the Lord developed in the Church, and the words of the Lord fruitful in a new life of love and patience

and victory in the world; and then the old man poured out the rich reminiscences of his life in matchless sentences, which blend the eloquence of the Christ and of His most responsive disciple.

4. It required a disposition to which the divine, in the person and life of Jesus, had peculiar and transcending attractions. So had this loving, unworldly young heart sought Him; so had he found Him; as such had he lived with Him; parted from Him twice at the cross,—where he was probably the only disciple present, keeping his love and obedience unspotted—and again upon Olivet; but had again found Him, thenceforth to enter day by day into a truer oneness with Him as with his own true life; to see Him daily more clearly, to remember Him always more vividly, to adore Him ever more heartily, to love Him ever more fervently.

Does this detract from his testimony—from its truth or from its value? Or is it objected, that such a representation of the human life of our Lord, written after a long lapse of time, is too ideal? We can simply answer: When an artist studies a landscape through mornings of darkening clouds, through days of ripening sunshine, and evenings of transforming shadows, until the picture fills his imagination, and he becomes able to reproduce it from his own recreative mind, enriched, transfigured by the wonderful effects which nature can produce, but which only intellect can combine, the product is not the less valuable on account of the idealizing process. When a gospel comes to us, which is, in a peculiar sense, the result of a loving and adoring contemplation, perfected through many years of spiritual intercourse with the Ascended Master, during which that brief earthly life is seen through a constantly growing glory, it is not the less, but the more, valuable for that preparation. It is especially the divine in the Lord which bears contemplation and study, which grows upon every one who holds Him in loving remembrance, and tries to find out the full meaning of that life which came among us full of grace and truth. It justifies the marvellous impression, not to be at once

analyzed or put into words, which every one who holds intercourse with Jesus, as He lived among us, receives at once, but understands only afterwards. This fourth gospel is the true development of what the divine in Jesus meant to His most intimate companion, both eye-witness and student of his Lord's person, character, words, and deeds, in the compass of a short life as truly human as any which ever appeared upon earth. As such, it is the great and lasting testimony to the divinity of Jesus of Nazareth, who is both Saviour and Lord of men.

ARTICLE III.—MISSIONS.

BY FRANCIS BRENGLE, ESQ., FREDERICK CITY, MD.

MISSIONS is a subject that has engaged the attention of the best ability and energy of the Church for ages. Time was when the visible Church of God consisted of one hundred and twenty men and women, assembled in an upper room. They were full of fear and trembling before the opposition of the world. The Holy Ghost had no sooner descended upon them than they became full of zeal and boldness; zeal to convert sinners from the error of their way, and boldness to preach salvation to men, notwithstanding the dangers and obloquy to which they were exposed.

This was the immediate effect of the descent of the Holy Ghost. When the Apostles were with Jesus on earth, great earthly distinction floated before their imaginations. They heard the wondrous words He spoke, they saw how the Pharisees and Sadducees were afraid to ask Him any question, they saw His miracles, they enjoyed three years intimate association with this great ideal, and during all this time they had no true

conception of His mission, nor of their own. They followed Him as men followed Cæsar or Napoleon with unmeasured confidence in His abilities, and believing they would be crowned with success in the overthrow of existing systems, and of the men that were at their head, and in the substitution of Him and themselves in the position of leaders in that establishment which He would build up in its stead. Peter took the sword from the servant of the high-priest, and was willing with the arm of flesh to undertake the rescue of his Master. When He was set on by the Jewish populace all His disciples forsook Him. When Christ was taken down from the cross and buried, how entirely without hope they must have been. All their dreams of brilliant worldly success vanished in a moment. They must have feared for themselves the fate of their leader. How timid and troubled they were! No sooner were they relieved of their fear by the Holy Ghost, no sooner indeed had the Comforter come, than Peter stood up, not as a general or a great statesman as he once fondly imagined he would, but as a simple missionary of the cross, and as a missionary preached the greatest sermon that has issued from human lips since the death of our Redeemer. That sermon converted three thousand persons. The first effect of the gift of the Holy Ghost was to change the despairing band of the Apostles into undaunted and unwearied missionaries. Peter at first must have doubted his own identity when he experienced the wondrous change. James and John who asked Jesus to send fire down upon the people that had rejected Him, must have been in the same condition. Indeed they were all changed like unto that great change that will occur at the Resurrection. The gift of the Spirit bestowed upon them greater than the gift of tongues was the gift of true missionary zeal. This was one of the first gifts of God through His Spirit. When Paul was on the road to Damascus, and the voice from heaven spoke to him in answer to the question, "What wilt thou have me to do?" he was sent to Ananias, who was told that he was a chosen vessel unto the Lord, to bear His name "before the Gentiles, and kings and the children of Israel."

These are the pillars of the Church. If the first impulse of

the Spirit in them was to preach the Gospel to every creature, what ought we to do? How are we to judge ourselves? 'Christ's last command to His disciples was, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." When that command was given, the disciples were as unable to comply with it, as perhaps any other number of Jews. It was only when the Holy Ghost came upon them, that they were endued with the power to obey the command. Then desire and duty combined to urge them to the task. Before, they knew their duty, but from human weakness were unable to perform it. When the Holy Ghost descended upon them, they desired to do nothing else than their duty, even if it led through shame and hardship to an ignominious death.

Under the Jewish dispensation pious men do not seem to have been imbued with the missionary spirit. Moses, Joshua and David were all great men, full of faith and full of works, but they were only civil rulers of the Jewish people. The design of Providence before the coming of Christ seems to have been to maintain the Jews as a nation for the purpose of preserving the true faith undefiled by the universal idolatry until Shiloh came. Moses, Joshua and David, great as they were, were largely raised up for this purpose. It was with great difficulty that even two of the twelve tribes were prevented by the efforts of patriarchs, prophets and pious kings from relapsing into the worship of stocks, stones, and brazen images.

The Church of God barely maintained its existence among men from the time Adam was driven from Paradise until Shiloh did come. For four thousand years, the Church had been on the defensive. It was Jesus who first proclaimed an aggressive warfare against the world. The Lamb of God, meek and lowly in spirit, told His disciples, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth. I came not to send peace, but a sword. I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law." This aggressive warfare, the disciples, after they received the Holy

Ghost, felt themselves compelled to carry on. From the time that Christ ascended up on high, the Church has been a missionary organization. It has been carrying its standard into the territory of the unbelieving, regardless that it set men at variance with one another, "the daughter against the mother, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law." It has never taken a step backward. Whether on the sands of Africa, amid the jungles of Asia, on the fair fields of Europe, or amid the wilds of America, it has never known any such thing as defeat, or anything but ceaseless and aggressive warfare. It never will consent to treat for peace, for to treat with it means to surrender. Nations make war and make peace. But the Church of Jesus has nothing to do, but to wage an eternal war, until the ends of the earth are His. From the day of Pentecost until now, it has been waging this war, and will wage it until the end of the world.

Satan took Jesus up into a high mountain, and showed Him all the kingdoms of this world, and said unto Him, all these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. The offer was declined.

Although He had refused to accept them at the hands of Satan, and exhorted His disciples never to use the weapons of a carnal warfare, the peasant of Judea had not been dead fifty years, before the palace of the Cæsars was filled with his followers, and in a comparatively short time the Roman Empire acknowledged His sway by a loyalty and devotion which was never accorded to the proudest of the Cæsars. Now He is worshipped from a hundred thrones, and the mightiest nations of the earth are those which have most nearly embraced the truth of the religion He founded. All this has been accomplished by the missionary endeavors of the followers of Jesus. The difference between the Church now, and the Church before the ascension of Christ, is, that the Church now is a missionary organization. The millions that now profess Christ's name were brought to Him by missionary effort. As one of the first effects of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the first disciples was to move them to

go out into the world and bring it from death unto life, so we must be moved to do the same, otherwise we have reason to doubt, if we are imbued with the Holy Ghost. The hardships and dangers that confront missionaries of the present day are as nothing compared with those before the Apostles. The world is before the Church waiting to be subdued unto it. The prophecy of Joel is still in the act of fulfillment; "And it shall come to pass in those days, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants and on my handmaidens, I will pour out in those days of my Spirit: and they shall prophesy."

The Spirit of power and courage that was bestowed upon the Apostles is promised unto us. That person or that church must be destitute of the Holy Spirit that is unwilling to take part in the cause of missions at home or abroad. Every denomination of Christians is compelled in justice to its own conscience to do its best in this cause. That denomination that takes an inactive attitude in regard to missions, thereby indirectly confesses that it is not a branch of Christ's kingdom. It is as much our duty to do what we can to bring the light to the dark places of the earth as it is to love our neighbor. The doctrine that we must love our neighbor is one of the crowning ornaments of the Church, the principle to preach the Gospel to every creature, is one of the vital organs of the Church, without which the Church must die. As the individual must die, when the heart ceases its functions, so the Church must die that has none of the missionary spirit.

The members of the Reformed Church are in gross error, when they imagine that the Reformed Church has no duties in this regard. They seem to think that the duty of missionary operations is confined to the denominations larger than our own. This is an entirely false view. Whether we have as much money or as many ministers, and can for these reasons establish as many congregations as some other denominations,

is not the question. We owe it to ourselves as part of the Church of Christ to be obedient to our great Master, by engaging in missionary work. Let us envy no other denomination its numbers or wealth, but let us aid them wherever we can. To engage in this work in any spirit of rivalry with other denominations is sin. Let us enter heartily into it, because we love our Lord, and from no other motive. Let those of small means and those of larger means contribute, as impartially to themselves, as if they stood in the revealed presence of their Maker.

In regard to Home Missions the Reformed Church occupies no unenviable position. If we had the means, after we have provided for those in this country that belong to us, who are scattered over the length and breadth of the land, we have a certain fraction of the German emigration to this country, to which we could devote our attention with better chances of success than any other denomination. It behooves us to do our best. Fixed policies are not always the wisest. Merchants get customers, doctors patients, and lawyers clients wherever they can. So let the Church establish churches wherever it can, whether in the country or in the city. Let us do our best, and when we stand before the Great Judge, He will award unto us the welcome plaudit, "Ye have done what ye could."

ARTICLE IV.—THE MISSING LINK.

BY PROF. R. K. BUEHRLE, A. M.

IN the fundamental law of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, occur the important words: "The General Assembly shall provide for the maintenance and support of a thorough and efficient *system* of public schools, wherein *all* the children of this commonwealth, above the age of six years, may be educated." Constitution of Penna., Art. X. Sec. 1.

Dr. Wickersham in commenting on this article said: "It will enable such a *system* to reach both *high* and *low* enough, and to give to all parts of its work the greatest degree of perfection. No constitutional objection will hereafter stand in the way of the establishment of schools of the *highest* grade."

Seven years have passed away and substantially nothing has been done in the way of improving the *system* as such. Fondly have we hoped, fervently have we prayed that, with such a liberal provision in the Constitution would also come the mind to plan and the hand to execute that which was still wanting to constitute ours, at least humanly speaking, a perfect system.

The ripe experience, enriched by a tour through foreign lands, of the distinguished officer at the head of our euphemistically named, *system* of public instruction, had given us a right to expect a vigorous effort to be put forth in the direction of removing the defects in it, and unifying the various educational agencies of the state, thus constituting them a real system. Why this was not attempted, we of course do not know. What we do know is that the desirability of such a movement was clearly recognized by Dr. Wickersham, and, at the meeting.

of the state association in 1873, at the very time the constitutional provision was framing, the educators of Pennsylvania were strongly urging action, and he apparently agreed with them, thus leading them to expect, confidently that something would be done by him to supply this long-felt desideratum. [See *Penna. School Journal*, Vol. xxii. pages 98, 99, and 100, also *Annual Report for 1873*, in *School Journal*, Vol. xxii. pp. 224-242.]

Verily, "we had thought that it should be he" that should place the keystone into the arch, that should bind "all the building, fitly framed, together," that it might "grow into an holy temple." But this was not so to be. "To labor and not to see the end of our labors, to sow and not to reap, to be removed before our work has been appreciated, and when it will be carried on, not by ourselves, but by others—is a law so common in the highest characters of history, that none can be said to be altogether exempt from its operation." "Events have moved too slow, and the generation passes away which should have supported the chief, a word has been spoken unadvisedly with his lips, and his prospects are suddenly overcast, and Canaan is won, not by the first and greatest of the nation, but by his successor."

What is wanted above everything else, and wanted *now*, is the union of the public schools with the higher institutions of learning. This can be brought about only by the creation of what Dr. McCosh in 1873 called Upper Schools. (See *Address before the National Teachers' Association*, held at Elmira, N. Y., 1873).

The chasm between these two so-called systems of instruction, the public schools and the colleges, dares not exist much longer. Its existence has done mischief in diverting normal schools from their true mission,—making academies, seminaries, mere boarding-schools under state patronage of them, and obliging colleges to make bricks without straw, to graduate good classical students without proper preparatory schools. Its continued existence threatens the welfare of the lower or primary schools on the one hand, and the existence of the normal

schools on the other, and as we are now entering on a new regime, the present time may not be inauspicious for the taking of this great step. It will be the aim of what follows to point out how this may be done, but to do this, it will be necessary first of all to show how the present state of affairs was brought about.

That there were, formerly, in this state, academies, in part founded and supported by the state; that these academies were intermediate between the then so-called public schools and the colleges; that, in these academies, pupils were prepared for the latter; that those who were thus prepared were few in proportion to the whole number attending; that in order to encourage more to pursue the study of the classics, the state made appropriations to these academies in proportion to the number of pupils pursuing these studies, including German;* that these upper schools gradually disappeared, with the general diffusion and improvement of the public schools, as the snow before the vernal sun, so that there is now a chasm between the public schools and the colleges, on account of which the interests, not only of colleges but of higher education in general, suffer, is generally known and deplored.

Whoever is thoroughly conversant with systems of popular education, knows full well that not only does primary education influence higher, but also (and this is not so generally understood and acted on) that higher education can be made not to influence merely, but, we feel tempted to say, to permeate, to condition primary education. That the colleges react on the high schools, the public schools, must be evident to all who will but bear in mind that the *teachers* of the latter are not seldom graduates of the former, and the principal teachers of the normal schools—the *teachers'* seminaries—even, are very generally college-bred men. How our colleges and universities could be made to reach down to the lowest primary schools, how the rays from those intellectual lighthouses would illumine the

* See Act April 12, 1838, Sec. iv., also 38th Annual Report of Supt. of Common Schools of Penna., page **xxx**.

darkness at the bases of the hill of science were there but a proper understanding and a hearty acceptance of the work belonging to the sphere of each, were there but an end on the part of ambitious and pretentious high school teachers, of boasting of high school education as superior to collegiate, of depreciating the advantages of liberal culture, (of which they are frequently entirely innocent) of dissuading ambitious pupils from preparing for college! Did the public-school teachers, directors, and superintendents but earnestly strive not merely to provide opportunities (always niggardly, and often under protest, and with many left-handed compliments to those who are so unfortunate as to be obliged to avail themselves of them) for pupils to prepare for college, but rather to *encourage* them to do so, they would soon see more progress made, even by those who intend to pursue a different course; and a more literary spirit would prevail in their schools generally.

No doubt the example of Philadelphia establishing a high-school, whose graduates cannot enter college for want of a knowledge of Greek, and whose people nevertheless believed it due to the literary reputation of the city to say that the diploma of their high-school is evidence of equal scholarship with that obtained from colleges, has been largely imitated in other cities, until the desire to go from the public high-school to college has been so rare, that boards of directors often scarcely know whether to include the classics in the curriculum or not. Thus from not caring to avail themselves of these opportunities, the pupils have come to have them wholly denied, until we find, that in the largest cities in the state pupils must either obtain private tutors, or leave the public schools altogether if they desire to prepare for college, or, at least, the course is so badly arranged that precious time is wasted in the premature study of branches that belong to the college course.

No doubt the absence of college-trained teachers from our public schools, brought about by the large number of females employed, and which still tends to keep them away, is another

reason why the public school has failed to supply the place of the old-time academy. This is probably one reason why, as Dr. Hays says, "the mass of students in the colleges come from the country, where there are no high-schools";* for there male teachers still have some show of obtaining employment, and as a consequence it sometimes happens that a college graduate can make his influence felt among the boys in our public schools.

Such was substantially the condition of things when the normal schools were organized, and those who prescribed the course of study for their students, entirely oblivious of the wants of pupils desiring liberal culture, and as if with the clearly defined object of creating a chasm between the public schools and colleges, carefully *excluded* the classics from the elementary course, made it optional in the scientific, and organized such a grotesque arrangement facetiously called a classical course, as scared off all but three (and since these graduated in '59, the first year of the existence of these schools, the credit of their classical attainments should not be given to the normal schools) out of the whole number of students who have attended these teachers' seminaries for the last twenty years.† A slight change for the better has taken place recently, as one book of Cæsar is now required in the elementary course, and we believe that in some of the normal schools, Latin has sometimes been allowed to be taught to such as *chose* to study it in any course. As we have no statements to guide us, we can but surmise the extent to which this has been carried, both in regard to the branches and the number of students. Thus we have the strange anomaly of teachers holding certificates of the highest grade of competency, given by authority of the state, who are utterly incompetent to prepare a youth for the freshman class in an ordinary Pennsylvania college.

It can hardly be expected that the graduates of these insti-

* See *Penna. School Journal*, Vol. xxxii. page 90.

† See *Report of Supt. of Public Instruction of Penna.*, for the year 1880, page lxiv.

tutions will be enthusiastically in favor of studies practically ignored by their alma mater. Such is the deplorable state of affairs at present; let us now turn our thoughts to the more agreeable task of throwing out a few hints, it may be, that will tend to bring about a change, to bridge over the chasm, or rather to elevate the higher public schools to their true position and work—that of providing opportunities for those who intend to prepare for college, as well as for the ordinary affairs of life. We repeat, this is their legitimate function, and unless they rise to this conception of their sphere, the friends of liberal culture will be compelled to establish and maintain academies and seminaries between them and the colleges, to the great injury, if not total ruin of the former. The friends of the high school, yea of the public school, cannot afford to lose the active sympathy and cordial co-operation of this element of society, much less to have it antagonistic. Nor can the friends of higher education, on their part, by establishing private schools do half the good they can do by bringing the public schools up to the plane of efficiency that would enable them to discharge this part of their functions. To us the solution of the difficulty is largely in the hands of the friends of liberal culture, and we will now indicate a few of the means that might be used to bring about this “consummation devoutly to be wished.”

First.—The college authorities, be they the presidents, faculties, or boards of instruction, should prepare a carefully planned preparatory course of instruction for the average public high school, with the understanding that pupils who pass a satisfactory examination in said course, will be entitled to admission to college. Such a course of study would aid superintendents and teachers of high schools in establishing courses of study, or in adapting those already established to the wants of students preparing for college; it would bring the matter to the attention of boards of directors, each of whom should be furnished with a copy; it would possibly lead to greater uniformity in the requirements for admission to college, and by

recognizing the high as preparatory schools bring about a better understanding between them and the colleges immediately above them. In the preparation of such a course of study, regard should be had to prevailing public opinion so far as it is compatible with the most approved thought on the subject of modern culture, and whether such a course would include or exclude Greek, whether French or German might be substituted for Greek or Latin, or both, one thing is certain, such a document published as the deliberate opinion of the college faculties of the state would go far towards authoritatively settling the question in many a school board, especially if it were accompanied by a vigorous defence of such studies as are least popular and therefore most frequently excluded from high schools.

Secondly.—The next step is a positive attack on *popular* ignorance, to be made by college faculties and all lovers and admirers of liberal culture. European professors salaried by the state, or teaching in richly endowed institutions, pride themselves on their freedom from dependence on public opinion, but we hope that that day may never dawn for America; for it means a learned caste and an ignorant populace. We want no chasm between those who attend the highest literary institutions, and the graduates of the primary schools. The normal, natural order is continuous, "*Natura saltum horrescit*,"—it admits of no breaks, and the question ever on the lips of the American laborer, artisan or mechanic is, "What is your culture to me?" "Of what intellectual, social, or civil advantage to me is it that this college is located in our town, or that that university lately received an additional endowment?" One of the chief evidences of progress in this century, is the recognition of the truth that there is no selfishness so supreme—not even that in the possession of wealth—as that which retires into itself with all the accomplishments of liberal learning and rare opportunities, and looks upon the intellectual poverty of the surrounding world in proud disdain, and without a wish to relieve it. "The

American scholar cannot afford to live for himself." The graces of culture will not be wasted if exercised among the humblest and the least cultured. Therefore if the colleges want co-operation on the part of the teachers of the public schools, they must associate, and as a consequence co-operate with them in their efforts to elevate the *people*. They must be found at the teachers' meeting, the county institute, the state association. They must contribute their best thoughts to the teachers' professional literature; they must demonstrate the advantages of a knowledge of classical culture, which are sometimes scarcely appreciable in their graduates; they must spread out the riches to be acquired by digging after Greek roots, in the presence of the miner, if his son is to delve there. They must convince the teacher of the high school that the study of Latin pays, if he or she is to fire the youthful imagination of his or her pupils. In short, they must popularize their ideas by mingling with the intellectually ignoble throng.

Thirdly.—Such a course of action, it is believed, would prepare the people for an act of the legislature supplementary to the present school-law *requiring* boards of directors in cities and towns to admit all applicants from adjoining districts into their schools, on the payment of a pro-rata assessment, or amount for tuition, which must in all cases be paid by the *district* in which the applicant resides, provided that such application is made for the purpose of pursuing branches not taught in his own district. Such an act should also require boards of directors to place the classics in the course of study on the application of patrons of the public schools whose children desire to study them, provided that the teaching of such branches does not necessitate the employment of additional teachers. Another provision should make it *obligatory* to grade village and borough schools wherever more than one school or one teacher is required.

Finally.—Such action, it is to be hoped, would arouse those who are responsible for the course of studies in our normal schools, and possibly sufficiently enlighten them to justify the

expectation on our part of a desirable substitute for the (most unscientific in an educational point of view) scientific course now pursued in those institutions. We might then possibly obtain a body of teachers educated and qualified to take charge of the town and city high schools, and thus obtain the missing link in the chain which binds elementary to collegiate education.

ARTICLE V.—MAN'S SUBJECTIVE RELIGIOUS HISTORY.

BY REV. ALLEN TRAYER, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

EVERY natural and human existence has a beginning, which is involved in the mystery of minuteness. Every living thing and creature, plants, trees, insects, birds, and beasts, and the world on which we dwell have come forth in their present form of activity and life from a mysterious and only partially explored past. Whichever way we turn, we find some dark, stubborn fact confronting us. But the prince of created mysteries is the soul, valuable above all that is found in the stream of nature. After its creation it has a progressive and continuous existence. Its middle life is an expansion, the fruit of a process of growth and of development. The end is a perfection, if moral evil is not its destroyer. The most important questions which we can propose for our consideration are, What am I? Whence did I derive my origin? And what will be the result of my busy history and my destiny? We are moving along the stream of human history some thousands of years from its dawn. Far back in paradise, in the garden, the little spring bubbled, and along this stream of being we find ourselves. The history of the race is fearful, and yet splendid. That of the individual is painful and dark, or morally beautiful, as it stands related to sin or holiness. The growth and the

progress of the individual and of the race is deeply instructive, indicating a plan, and purpose, and moral order, and progress in good or evil. Who can fully conceive the nature of death, or portray with pen or pencil, the import of the word death? And the word creation is equally mysterious. Our origin being in the past, we can trace its history and the separate links to the fountain, which remains an unexplained mystery. We spin and weave the present into the future of the thread of life, but we are unacquainted with the nature of the end, which is concealed in the mists of death. And what a panoramic spectacle it presents. How persistently permanent it seems; how sorrowful and how ephemeral in its parts. How pathetic, how solemn, how profoundly mysterious.

It may serve to elucidate this subject by inquiring—1st. What were the views of the ancients who lived in the darkness of a remote antiquity? 2d. What were the conceptions of human life and of religion, formed by philosophers who lived in an age nearer to us, and in the border of a twilight produced by faint rays of revealed truth? 3d. What is man's religious experience and history, as unfolded by those who live amid the light of Christianity and of modern civilization? In the early dawn of the world's history men were agitated and troubled by many of the questions which we discuss. The dark shadows of existence, lengthening and deepening as the age of the race increased, and experience was attained, attracted the attention of the ancients, and they were forced from the buddings of their moral nature to consider the shadows on the dial-plate of existence, and the deeper problems, the profounder realities which are the base and the centre of human anxiety and of thought. Learning very early in their individual and social history the reality and certainty of death, they were solicitous to know its nature and results. Probably every soul experienced awe and anxiety and deep distress in view of the experience to which they were subjected by the fact. They observed their fellow travellers going through one dark gateway and disappearing. One general fact was observed to complete the

scene with all—death, the closing of the earthly, whatever that might mean in its deep and unsolved import. The unconscious clay, bereft of the animating principle, they knew turned to dust, whatever might be the result with the intelligent and moving principle, which was once there as the master. The departed did not return to answer any inquiry which might be proposed. The stream always set and moved in one direction, without a single interruption of a reverse nature. No part of the current of life ever returned with driftings from the other shore, speaking of a life continued, and another country reached by the lonely voyager.

But the ancients never had a definite and truthful conception of the meaning of life. They were anxious and troubled and perplexed inquirers. While their experience was limited, they were conscious of deep spiritual wants; they were troubled with all the deep and intricate and mysterious questions which spring up in every heart, and which must be solved for every individual, or remain a source of trouble. If we, amid the light of Christianity and the growth of knowledge feel that thick darkness hangs over the existence of man on earth, how deep must that have been in which the ancients were involved? They felt the unspeakable solemnity of existence, and the deep moral darkness of the age in which they lived; and more than this, they could scarcely separate their lives from the experience of a dream. The secret of life was like that of the sphynx's, an enigma which they could not read. They realized, as well as we, that the race and the individual stand in the centre of immensities, magnitudes, and distances, and orbs that roll tireless in their orbits, and that the soul, as created, stands in the conflux of twin eternities, one before, the other in the past; one that has departed or always was, the other constantly rolling in on us, and that they twine their influences around us, while we unfold the span of our earthly life. The stream of time rushing past, sweeps on with a steady, heavy current. Behind and before there was, to them, a dark gulf, and no certain and steady light to illumine the cavern, or to reveal the

dangerous rocks and quicksands, and to point out the path of life, safety, and of peace. They had professional prophets, whom they consulted, and whose utterances were received. Some believed that during the balmy hours of quiet sleep, when the senses were sealed in deep repose, or when the first strong slumbers of the night come on man, when the soul seems released from the control of natural laws, that there might be actual intercourse between man and unseen spirits by means of dreams and visions. They sought to enter into a covenant with the dead, and supposed that they would make known to them the mysteries that were hidden from man's foresight. They consulted the stars, the fixed, the wandering planets. They considered their appositions and conjunctions, and judged that they might exert an influence on human destiny and the future of man. They had oracles which they consulted and revered, and they made inquiries of the strangers whom they met in the desert and in their lonely marches isolated from the paths of pilgrims.

The primitive men of the race saw nature and active life with the mind of a child. Finding much that was mysterious, they pondered it unsatisfied in mind. The unsolved problems were handed down and questioned by their successors. Those questions which were answered, produced a charming intoxication of life for the time, satisfying wants and responding to curiosity. He saw the world through a softly colored vapor. Nature smiled on him, and he enjoyed her favors. Men in early ages experienced joys, and were also the victims of terror. Our experience being the result of the accumulated knowledge of ages, we expect nothing remarkable from the infinite combinations of things, but the child and the man in the infancy of the race know not what may come from the new arrangements and combinations that go on before him. Knowing very little of the actual, he believes more in the possible. He creates a fantastic world of his own, which enchants and then frightens him. His dreams left a marked and deep impression on his mind. He related them to the friends around

him, and not exercising the sharp analysis which, in later years of reflection, places us face to face with stern and cold realities, he failed to discriminate between visions and realities. Such was the rude and the inexperienced primitive man. He was scarcely detached from nature. He conversed with her, spoke to her, heard her voice, and dreaded her manifestations of displeasure. She seemed as a mother, to whom he was arterially bound, as a living and breathing person. The rich variety of physical phenomenon by which he was surrounded made various impressions, which took form and body from his imagination. These became his gods in many instances, and idolatry may have originated from this movement of the mind. If history has taught us anything, it is that in the infinite variety of society and manners, times and places, nothing is stable enough to be held fixed and firm under the eye, and that the history of the human soul offers a picture and an image of incessant motion, change and growth in good or evil. The spectacle of long-continued darkness and aberrations considered by an elevated mind, awakens not disdain, but the conviction of the great fact that humanity is in gloom and darkness; and that by means of truth is working out its destiny and completing its mission.

The religious life of the soul on the earth is like a vision of the ancient seer. There are veils hanging around it, which are dim and shadowy. There are solemn and silent hours when there are addressed to the soul vague impressions and dim unshapen reveries. There is some light, also some darkness. There is faith, there is also unbelief. "There is much of deep import in this life, like that which Eliphaz saw in the visions of the night—not clear, not palpable, or at least not usually recognized and made familiar; but it cometh as it were in the night, when deep sleep falleth on man; it cometh in the still and solitary hours; it cometh in the time of meditation or of sorrow, or of some awful and overwhelming crisis of life. It is secretly brought to the soul, and the ear receiveth a little thereof. It is a spirit that passeth before us, and vanisheth

into the night shadow; or it standeth still, but we cannot discern the form thereof; there is an undefined image of truth; there is silence, and at length there is a voice." With all the effort thus put forth for light, life still remained a mysterious and unsolved enigma. And the longer the race lived, and the more knowledge was taught, the darker were the problems that still continued to arise, or old ones still haunted and troubled the sons of men. When they attempted to trace back and find the genesis of things, they became involved in darkness almost sensible to the touch. When they attempted to form conceptions and speculate on the future, they found no limits, no defined boundary to the grand succession of phenomenon ever revolving before them. In the external and in the internal worlds they beheld objects and experienced perpetual changes, the beginning and the ending of which escaped them. When man looked inward he discovered that both terminations of the thread of consciousness were beyond his grasp. He could not remember when nor how consciousness began, and he could not examine fully and minutely the consciousness of any one moment, for that passes and becomes an object of full and mature thought only after it has passed, and not while passing along and becoming a part of the mind's experience and the object of its activity. When they attempted to turn from the succession of phenomenon, and to enter the external or the internal world, to the nature and the ground of that phenomenon, they found themselves in deeper darkness, in more troubled waters that were rolling without a visible shore or a bottom that could be fathomed by man. The outward manifestations of phenomenon were discovered to be alike inscrutable in genesis, development and nature. Thus they learned the littleness of the human intellect. They found bounds to its powers in both the inner and the outer world. They conjectured wisely that this soul will have a relation with all that here transcends our limited experience far away in the future.

With many of the ancients, a dim pantheism was the pre-

vailing form of belief. They had certain sensible experiences, gained by a limited range of observation. They judged that they were a part of nature, and that if there was a great Spirit, they were a part of that Spirit, and would return to it. Existing for a time as separate individuals, they thought that they would return to the general soul, and find reassimilation thereto. Looking on the phenomenon of creation with a limited reflection, and seeing the phenomenon of life and death, they attained this belief. And there are traces of it over the known world. Hindoo speculations are replete with this unsubstantial dream and delusion. They found many analogies for this faith, and not being able to discriminate, they rested in error.

There are mysteries in connection with the soul that no man can solve. They baffle lynx-eyed scrutiny, and analogies are not applicable to them, because they are drawn from the natural world, and the soul is not in this order. They found analogies and images in nature, and on these they rested their conviction. "The annual developments of vegetable life from the bosom of the earth, drops taken from a fountain and retaining its properties in their removal, the separation of the air into distinct breaths, the soil into individual atoms, the utterance of a tone gradually dying away in reverberated echoes, the radiation of beams from a central light, the exhalation of particles of moisture from the ocean, the evolution of numbers out of an original unity—these are among the things by which an exhaustless ingenuity has supported the notion of the emanation of souls from God." As men analyzed truths, they separated one thing from another, and thus gradually attained a clear conception of a distinction in nature, and one object has ceased to be confounded with another, entirely the reverse.

The radical idea of the Pelasgic worship was the adoration of nature. They regarded this and the earth as living and divine. And as nature was adored, this was imagined as endowed with vitality. The Grecians saw a thousand analogies between human forms and pure ideas and conceptions which

have escaped us. But they failed of a correct interpretation of nature. They saw every object as only the image of a living being dwelling therein. The primitive man did not look on nature as an actual and natural order, but as a continual play of living and free powers. In this remote period, there was no clearly defined and established doctrine, no positive religious faith, no authentic religious books. There were no clearly defined established moral laws, as the problems of this nature were unsolved. They did not contend for truth with the martyr's zeal. The Greek was the disciple of his age, climate and nature. "The glory with which the world shines in his eyes, the deified life, the poetic cry of his soul, that was his worship, a celestial worship involving an unselfish act of adoration, and free from all the subtlety of regeneration." The charm of the Homeric age of the world was the awakening of a common life, liberty disporting with the heart of conviviality in the full sunshine. It was the age when humanity came out of its burrowing places in cellars and woods, dens, and the damp of the unkempt forests, to shake off the sleep of its childish age, and to act and spring to the field of intellectual action, and to revel in the adventures of heroic life. Recognizing the beauty of the natural world, materialism itself suggested to man the thought of an immaterial principle, the soul which has a life of a certain kind while on earth, and which is the subject of good or the victim of evil. The outward senses, by means of which we study the world, awaken within the consciousness of a soul. The past suggests the future; the finite, the Infinite; the seen, the unseen; the material, the immaterial or the spiritual; time, eternity; the limited, the unlimited. Creation suggests the Creator. He who is conscious of having lived a certain period of time, entertains the conception of eternity as the correlative of that consciousness. These are facts in all human experience. With the use of limited senses and faculties he rises to the conception of what is beyond the visible heavens; beyond the conceivable in time, beyond all imagined power, glory, and beauty.

During man's early history he was confined in his experience to the narrowest compass. But his knowledge increased and his ways were enlarged, and gradually from this soul rays of thought would stream out toward the Infinite in its boundless grandeur and goodness. (a) Finally man discriminated between nature and himself. (b) He discriminated between himself and God. (c) He recognized each in relation to the other. Aided by revelation and reasoning from cause to effect, by a spontaneous effort he aspired to the conception of the Infinite Cause. He gained a loftier conception of creative power when he passed beyond natural causes and limits and existences. Finding his bodily origin on earth, and its existence perpetuated by means of earthly products, but believing that his destiny transcends the narrow limits of finite things, he aspires to resemblance to the character of the Infinite. The idea of God, distinct from nature and man, which is simple monotheism, has for ages been an element in our intellectual condition. And to us, the childish views of polytheists of antiquity are quite strange and incomprehensible. From our angle of vision, with more and brighter lights and a broader sweep of knowledge, they appear supremely unwise. Whatever views may have prevailed, the conviction now exists in all cultivated nations, that nature, man, and God exist distinct in their nature and stand on different planes, and do not flow or melt together. It has been affirmed that at certain stages of culture the human mind necessarily fastens on the idea of one God. But this conception of divinity has not been found in the infancy of many of the races, and others have continued during successive ages to cherish and advocate pantheistic and polytheistic conceptions of God. There may have been an original diversity in their modes of viewing nature. To the Greeks, nature was alive and vital with divine agencies. To the Hebrew and the Arabian conception, nature has no life. The desert is monotheistic in its influence on the mind. The mountain that looms against the sky, the bald and naked cliffs, with beetling brows, are purely monotheistic. The people who

dwell there believe that there is only one God. The desert and the mountain, uniform in their immensity and sublimity, reveal when first the object of scrutiny, the idea of the Infinite. Arabia has always been the bulwark of monotheism. Nature plays no active part in the religious conceptions and experience of the Semitic races, only in the light of elevating their views above nature. Their original conceptions are purely intellectual, metaphysical, and psychological. Their extreme simplicity of mind, without compass or marked diversity, without the finer plastic arts or philosophy, without a largely developed political life, without progress, revolves too resolutely and slavishly around this one grand conception. Their monotheism lacks the variety which would enhance its worth in human society. They see unity of government prevailing in the world; that evolution and movement accomplish the will of God, but by too rigid adherence to a single conception, they fail of that fruitful activity which a nature incessantly creative and alive to new relations and combinations has wrought out in the European mind. They recognize the will of a Supreme being, sovereign alone. God is God. He made, preserves, and accomplishes what He will. This is the seed, the expansion or development, the end of their creed. Simple and sublime it indeed is as a fact, but in combination with natural and human relations they fail. The Indians, the Grecians, the Indo-Europeans regarded nature animate and divine from the statue of Homer to the vessels of the Northmen, who were the earliest seamen. With them, the distinction of God from nature and man has varied and shifted as do the sands of the desert. Their gods engaged in the strife of the world, and hence they must share its vicissitudes, sorrows, defeats and successes.

2d. What were the conceptions of life formed by philosophers, who lived in an age nearer to us, and in the border of a twilight produced by faint rays of revealed truth, and what is his consequent religious history?

Heathen writers, as Socrates and Plato, the great thinkers of antiquity, who were contemplative men, looked into the philoso-

phy of things and carried their investigations up to the highest positions attainable by the reason, unaided by revelation. They considered attentively and calmly the subject of life, death and immortality, and the probable consequences of sin to the race and to the individual. Their stand-point was less favorable for investigation than ours, for we have life and light and immortality revealed in the gospel. They were thoughtful and serious explorers with only the dim torch of reason. Pagan traditions, and a few feeble and scattered rays of primitive reasonings were theirs. But they were unenlightened by revealed truth. The race had been on the border land of life for a few centuries, and at the best had only passed from the darkness of a moral midnight. But these men while they were somewhat familiar with the experience of the past, and their general surroundings, found themselves girt about with unexplored problems in nature; in human existence; and about the Infinite and the future, and man's relations thereto. They were inquirers for more light. Thick shades skirted this frontier which no light had hitherto penetrated; and no line had measured its depths. In their childhood, men were absorbed in the observation and use of the external world. The Soul engages their attention at a later date in their history. The external universe is in itself an imposing object of attention and stimulated curiosity. Thales and Pythagoras, the earliest representatives of philosophy, endeavored to explain the organization of the universe on the basis of a scientific faith. Their successors followed their line of march, and tried their powers on external nature and on moral and religious questions. It was a night of gloom, a longing vacuum of the soul, an hunger that was insupportable. It was the darkness of nature.

They had some good moral precepts. In the *Gorgias*, Plato represents Socrates as saying that it is better to be injured than to injure. And Confucius affirms that men ought not to do to others what they would not have others do unto them. These moral precepts approach near to the grand regulative law of Christ, but are not equal to it. Poets are the priests of nature,

and are cited as authority by the ethical, religious and legal authors on the intuitional convictions of men, because they most truly reflect the deepest feelings of our nature, and the native consciousness of man. They created and recorded the primitive faiths of men on these higher themes. They were the expounders of the religious tenets of Greece and Rome, and among them there was an essential unity in their religious beliefs, as delineated in the religious feelings of their countrymen. Communing with the inmost soul of man, penetrating to the source of feeling, analyzing, interpreting, anticipating and revealing the springs of thought and the movements of the unseen life, they gave form and reality to the popular creed. "To Homer and Hesiod were allotted the proud duty of making known to their countrymen the gods who watched over them and from whom they were descended. They rose at once to the rank and dignity of Prophets. Their poems, with a few of their earlier Bards, constitute for them a Greek Bible." And they regarded it as sacred as did the Hebrews theirs. They deemed themselves the favorites of heaven. Every hill-top and grove, river and fountain was the favored abode of some guardian divinity. The tendency of their belief was to one God, the Infinite. "Toward this grand idea, the religion of Greece seems to us to have been constantly verging; it beamed on the soul of Socrates; it hallowed the thoughts of Plato; it was not unknown to the vast mind of Cicero." In *Timæus*, 286, he says: "We say that it is necessary that whatever is generated should be generated from some cause. But to find out the Maker and Father of the universe is difficult, and when found, it would be impossible to describe Him." *Logos* IV. 709, B, reads thus: "God through good fortune governs all human affairs." The Divine existence was the keystone of Plato's philosophy, the starting point, absolute necessity of the whole system. Science he regarded as incomprehensible without the idea of the Deity. Hence in *Logos*, IV. 715, E, he calls "God the beginning, the end, and the measure of all things." Again in *Timæus*, 29, E, we read: "Let us declare on what

account the framing artificer settled the form of this universe. He was good. . . . He desired that all things should as much as possible resemble Himself: then as the Deity desired that all things should be good, He accordingly took everything that was visible and not in a state of rest, but in excessive agitation and disorder, and then reduced it from disorder into order, conceiving the latter to be better than the former."

This brings us to consider their views of immortality. They, Socrates, Plato and Cicero, affirmed that the Soul was immaterial. They presented the same facts which are now brought forward for the same purpose. Blind, cold, dead and organized or unorganized matter has no power or tendency to originate thought. The body does not and cannot think. Cicero says, "We see not indeed with our eyes those things which we behold; nor with any senses of the body; but as physiologists teach, as also physicians, who have seen them opened, and examined them, there are certain passages perforated, as it were, from the seat of the mind to the eyes, to the ears, to the nostrils. And thus it often occurs, when our minds are absorbed in thought, or embarrassed by the violence of some disease, we neither see nor hear, from which it is easily perceived that it is the mind which sees and hears, and not those parts which are the windows, as it were, of the mind; through which, however, the mind gets no intelligence unless it acts and attends." Holding it to be immaterial, they argue that it is immortal thus: "It is a law of our nature to believe it. We anticipate the endless future. Another reason is its spontaneous action, or self-motion. A third reason for their belief was found in the faculties and capacities of the Soul for improvement, its powers for invention and investigation, and for recollection, and for limitless acquisition in the future. In forming our judgment of what the soul is, if not utterly blind in physics, we cannot doubt that it has nothing mixed, nothing concrete, nothing coupled, nothing conjoined, nothing double; which being premised, certainly it can neither be composed, nor divided, nor rent asunder, nor pulled to pieces, nor therefore be destroyed."

Of the future they had far less than those who see through a glass darkly. They had scarcely a ray of cheering faith or a gleam of an animating hope. And the conviction of sin was so great that they were haunted with dark, painful thoughts. While they were troubled with the ills and the evils of life, as we and all men are, they did not know what life meant. Its problems were unsolved, and they had not the means for their solution. They struggled with doubt and darkness and standing in a wilderness of conflict, they started numerous questions along the dark line beyond which they had no knowledge, and the only answer they received was an impersonal sound. They turned to nature for light and trimmed her lamps. Sages like Plato and Socrates explored till wisdom swooned over the unexplained. Human philosophy with her airy wing was inadequate to the task. While human relations were susceptible of a solution of their relations to the Infinite they had not much knowledge, and they died with longing hearts, and with their eyes directed toward the heavens. They affirmed their convictions of human sinfulness, deep and radical, and they observed the sufferings of the innocent and the guilty alike, and that the innocent suffer for the guilty. Their experience was that sin has a train of evils always following close in its track. It was evident to them that a disposition to evil, and of evil, existed in the unseen nature and tendency of the soul, and this received confirmation in the character, from culture and habit, and these secure more fearful results. Plato in the *Gorgias* quotes from one of the old poets thus: "I have heard from the wise men that we are now dead, and that the body is our sepulchre." In another place he says that "the prime evil is inborn in souls, that it is implanted in men to sin." In the *Politicus* we read that "the nature of mankind is greatly degenerated and depraved, all manner of disorders infest human nature, and men being impatient, are torn in pieces by their lusts, as by so many wild horses." Again he speaks of an evil in nature; and of a disease in nature; and of an evil nature; and of a want of harmony in the soul. In the *Timæus* he asserts that "the cause

of corruption is from our parents, so that we never relinquish their evil ways, or escape the blemish of their evil habits." The Roman moralist, Seneca, inquires in the following strain: "What is it that when we set ourselves in one way, draws us in another, and when we desire to avoid any cause, drives us into it? What is it that so wrestles with our mind, allowing us never to settle any good resolution once for all?" In *Epis. 52*, Medea is represented by Ovid saying, "Desire draws me one way, conviction another. I see the better and approve; the worse and follow." The best taught and the wisest of the pagan scholars and the profoundest thinkers on philosophical subjects, whatever they attained as truth on the basis of reason and the light of nature, were never absolutely established, but were overhung with doubt and uncertainty. The heathen writer, Xenophorus, closes his work on nature as follows: "No man has discovered any certainty, nor will discover it, concerning the gods, and what I say of the universe. For if he uttered what is even most perfect, still he does not know it, but conjecture hangs over it all." The wisest were in dark twilight, and were oppressed with uncertainty. They grasped painfully after the meaning of life and waited with anxious hearts, tortured as the slave who knows not the disposition of his master. Passing through the varied scenes of life in this period of dimness of spiritual vision, the ancients were thrown back to an examination of principles. But this did not clear the mists from the troubled ocean of being, but discovered many of its marked features and mysterious relations and the necessity of light from heaven. There was deep, profound uncertainty, and the guilty experienced terror, aroused by the apprehensions of a coming judgment.

* 3d. *Man's Religious History*, as unfolded and formed under the influence of revealed Christian truth. How does Christian truth and religious principles transform and mould a man in his religious history, and secure to him a form of experience in disposition and will, which is so unique and blessed in its results? Certain questions arise which are both profound and practical, and require a solution that we may know the nature of our sub-

jective spiritual history. The most important are these. (a) Whence am I? (b) What am I in my nature and tendencies? (c) What must I become and be, that I may live and die in peace? (d) What are the means that I must use during my natural life, that I may be in harmony with my guidings, and may be led to submit myself to certain holy influences, and may move forward in goodness, rising higher and higher in the scale of perfection, that in the end of this bitter moral struggle and spiritual conflict, I may enter on a state and in a world of pure life and light and love?

Nearly all the great military, political and intellectual movements in the history of the world have been made by the Indo-European races. They were early engaged in the strifes proceeding from the ungoverned passions of men, and made national conquests. They admired the beauty of the world, but being distracted by the variety of the universe they failed of recognizing with certainty one Supreme Cause—the attainment of a pure monotheism. The moral world they failed to conquer. Religious movements belong seemingly, in a natural way, to the Semitic races. These seem endowed with a finer and surer insight for moral and religious truths, and responded at once with spiritual aspirations, when divinity was revealed and thundered on the mount, with supernatural wonders. They did not attain the truth of God by mere reflection and reasoning, but having their intuition of God quickened by revelation into life, they affirmed the existence of God; one God; He who is God alone, and not a part of nature or a natural cause. The doctrine of God, monotheism in the life of the world has been transcribed by the Semitic race on all others who have it. Previous to Judaism, Islamism and Christianity, the worship of the One, the only Supreme Being, was never clearly comprehended by the multitudinous races or nations. "Now these three grand religious movements are three Semitic facts, three branches of the same trunk, three versions of the same idea." Out of this idea of one, Infinite and Supreme, as a basis, has grown the only pure religious system, known to man. From

the idolatry of the entire oriental world previous to Abraham and afterwards, during the long and the dark centuries, to Islamism and to Mecca and to Sinai, is a long stadium in moral truth. From Sinai to Jerusalem and Jewish institutions is a long link in the chain of moral and spiritual life. From these to full-orbed Christianity, there is a chasm so broad that it has been extremely difficult to persuade either Jews or Mohammedans to look across the gulf and survey the surpassing loveliness and moral grandeur, and the holy beauty of Christ, His mission, work, teachings and institutions, or to admire the surpassing wonders of its spiritual suns and planets, its fixed stars and comets, its twinkling orbs and all of its grand and beautiful astronomy.

The question arises, whence and how did this Semitic stock derive its conceptions of our God, and of a living and working faith for the spread of this grand ideal, and which the best and most cultivated portion of mankind has admitted on the strength of its teachings? Monotheism is not an invention of man. On the burning plains of India or on her mountains, where the oriental mind has thought with so much originality and power, man has not to this day discovered this grand moral sun. The keen intuition of the Greek intellect has not sufficed to bring man to this idea; or this reality to man, without the co-operation of Semitic teachings in the Jewish line. The doctrine of God is found alone and complete in the most imperious instincts and institutions of their mind and heart. As already observed, the religion of the Indo-races was a dim form of pantheism. They did not find the distinctions between nature, man and God as readily as the race that settled east of, and on the border of the great middle-sea, where men felt the breath of the ocean and the mountains. They worshipped their own sensations and imaginings. Their adoration was an echo of nature. This prevailed over the oriental world, till the Hebrew monotheism initiated them into more elevated, pure and truthful ideas of the self-existent God. The Hebraistic notion, idea and unswerving conviction of God the Supreme, came to them without

philosophical reasonings. It was not the result of conquest, of speculative progress in philosophy, but was one of its first perceptions, and came through the soul's instincts, and the intuition of the reason, aroused and quickened by a primitive revelation from God Himself, as in the case of Abraham. They knew that while living in the ample domain of nature, they were detached from the universe in which they dwell, and at once were led to the reasonable inference of the third point, viz. : God, the being who was, is, and ever shall be, while the Indo races seem to have regarded themselves as arterially bound to her.* Nature is akin, and throbs in all her parts with natural forces. It is not unfruitful of truth, but is pervaded by the manifestations of Divine power, though absolutely distinct from it. And what a grand conception is this simple idea of God, isolated from the world, yet that world fashioned like a vessel in the hands of the potter, guiding, forming and peopling it with rational souls. The Indo races regarded and do now, life as a struggle; the universe as a perpetual change, and in some form as a transporting revolution and progress into the physical and intellectual administration of God.

We verily believe and are convinced on the testimony furnished by nature and reason, that there is a being who knows all that we know; all that we do not know; who is the spring and author of all that exists; who is infinite in knowledge; and who in the beginning of the historic period, created the heavens and the earth. Most of the speculations of the ancients in their schools of philosophy, grouped around the belief that the universe was eternal; or that it was self-evolved; and that creation was an absurdity. But we regard it as a vagary of philosophy and a chimera of the mind, to hold that our part of the creation, and that the smallest, the union of particles, is the author of the whole. This view is as unreasonable as to assert that a star which is known only by its light, consists of rays, single or combined, or that the anthem of the ocean is the offspring of unconscious sound. God is invisible except in His works, where we see Him, not as a person, but the evidences of

His power, wisdom and goodness. We observe and study the laws, principles and workings of the world, and of the natural forces, and science is evolved. Induction and deduction unveil the mysteries of the created universe. Science discloses the methods of God's working in nature, and the modes in which the world rolls along, but reveals no where to the eye the Infinite cause. These natural truths of the Divine mind when lovingly received and used, quicken the spiritual nature and prompt the hand to execute and find new means of comfort, thrift and enlargement.

Truth, natural, or spiritual, or rational, nurtures the soul, as resolution slackens desire, and blunts the knowledge of unhal- lowed thirst. And all single truths are connected with the grand and primitive ideas from which they radiate and of which they are efflorescences. These germ ideas and thoughts and passionate and emotional utterances are rooted and centered in the natural entities and the Spiritual Infinity from which they spring into life, power and beauty. If there is light, there must be the central orb from which it emanates. If there is an infinite ocean of truth, there must be an unfailing fountain ; as science comprehensively includes every fact and every law of every branch and department of truth, physical, moral and mental, so all science must be traced to one central source, God, the Infinite and Eternal.

"There is no tree that rears its crest,
No form or flower that cleaves the sod,
No bird that sings above its nest
But tries to speak the name of God,
And dies when it has done its best."

(b). What am I in my nature and tendencies? There are certain truths denominated those of natural and revealed religion. The latter are found in the facts and principles of revelation and receive confirmation strong in the analogies of nature. Christian truth furnishes us with a knowledge of God ; of ourselves ; and of our relation and our state in reference to Him. We were created in the image of God, but we have lost

that image. Man is now a finite personality, fallen, sinful, guilty, intensely wicked, polluted and gangrened with sin, but susceptible of restoration. There was a time when they, the federal heads of the race were not guilty of actual sin, and that for a specific period. There was no desire in their nature tending to sin; or sinful. The root of their being was pure and so far from sin, that transgression did not of itself spring from it. In his whole constitution he was most excellent, yet he could sin. His excellence which was that of a finite, moral being, consisted in this: his disposition, his will, and his acts did not tend to evil, were not biased thitherward. The wrong they were able to do, they had no disposition or volition to perpetrate. "What a piece of work was man! How noble in reason! How infinite in faculties! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a God! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals." But of this beauty and glory he has been shorn by the might of sin.

Religion means to rebind, the re-union of a sundered cord or chain, the restoration of man to God; the harmonious adjustment of all the relations between God and man, creator and creature. (a) The sum and the substance of our subjective religious experience is to give up our disposition, and will and ways to God, who has the right to control and direct the being He has made. (b) It is penitently to acknowledge our sinfulness and turn from it, and flee from sin with holy horror, for with the whip of the scorpion it pursues us. (c) It is to pray for mercy through the sacrifice and person of the Lord Jesus Christ. (d) It is to put our trust in Him, who is the only mediator between God and man. "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins." Isaiah 43: 25. We ask what are the facts of revelation, and ascertaining these, we are led to faith in Him who can be known only in experience as facts reveal Him to the soul, which facts are contained in the revealed will of God, the written revelation. It is a pleasure to multiply stores of truth

and amass treasures of knowledge, but deeper in importance than natural or human knowledge, is that religious life which consists in fulfilling our relations to God the Source of life. And profound will be our satisfaction when we find ourselves in perfect sympathy with the Infinite Father. The truths of natural religion shadow forth those of the written page, and lead us naturally to the disclosures of all the principles of the Old and New Testaments. The truth of God must be appropriated by the free action of the mind, that our relations to Him may be realized and fulfilled, and this belief in Christ will lift us above the depression of calamity, and render us thoughtful and serene.

Real life, and not the shadowy veil, consists of a becoming, and then having the life of God in the human soul. To have this is to be renewed. The point of divergence from the old life of evil and sin, is the dawn of the new life. This real life is neither that of the body, nor of the understanding, for the body is not life, neither is the tree of knowledge the tree of life, but it consists of the harmony of the disposition, and will and life or ways with God, realizing and responding in an absolute sense to the claims of the Infinite and the pure. To have this is to be renewed in spirit, and to be set apart and dedicated to God, and made godly. It is to set our affections on things above, and not on things on the earth, as the supreme desire of the soul; to hunger and thirst after righteousness. Our real life under Christian influences, is abiding under this law of love, living amid favorable and unfavorable circumstances, shaping our inherited tendencies by the truths which are revealed, and which we receive and obey. All beside this dies, and is only evil and transient. It is not what we gather around us by mechanical forces and muscular effort, but what the soul becomes and is in its disposition, and what is incorporated in its experience by the appliances of truth. It is what we choose; what we will; what we feel; what we do, and what we gather and hive in the soul. It is not only our connection with man and nature, but our relations to Him who created us, and who

has revealed His will to us, who has communicated to us essential truths, not by material signs alone, but by direct and indirect influences on the soul. And this life of three-score and ten, is only a brief part of an endless career, purposed and planned as a part of the vast displays of a moral and spiritual universe. And in the germs of the soul, there are the principles for a sublime life, eternal in duration, found in the nature of the soul.

"Thus we come to form a nobler and sublimer idea of religion, to consider the great fixed point around which the moral world revolves, while itself remains unchanged; or rather as the emblem of Him who gave it, the all-embracing medium in which every other thing moves, increases and lessens, is born and destroyed, transiently attiring its outward manifestation. We come to consider it as the last refuge of thought, the binding link between the visible and invisible, the revealed and the discoverable,—the determinations of all problems in outward nature and in the inward soul; the fixing and the steadying element of every science, the blank and the object of every meditation. It appears to us even as the olive, the emblem of peace, is described by Sophocles—a plant not set by human hands, but by spontaneous and of necessary growth in the great order of created growth, fearful to its enemies, and so firmly grounded as that man in ancient or later times, hath been unable to uproot it."

(d) How does Christianity touch and influence and mould the soul that it may be restored? The reply is that its truths being spirit and life stimulate to inquiry and examination. Its vital breathings produce feeling, thought, inquiry, freedom, and loving action. Its challenge and admonition to the world is prove all things. Christian truth is the most powerful stimulus that can be applied to the soul of man, if we except the action of the Divine Spirit. And this Spirit comes to man's heart and will and affections through and along the avenues of truth. It stimulates to development and growth and culture, all the higher powers of our nature. It leads to the restraint of the

lower and the baser elements. It harmonizes all our powers, and renders man at peace with himself, and it restores man to purity and peace with God, and leads him to use nature in obedience to her laws, and then wisely blesses him.

It begins with God, the highest conception of which man is capable,—the Infinite, the Eternal. Amid the realms of existence there is a sun which is the origin of all that exists. He pervades and sustains everything, animate and inanimate. He creates a few germs and elements to unfold into life and beauty all the splendors that we behold in the vast universe. And there is an eye which is itself of sunlike nature, and made for that sun. And that sun is God, and that eye is the soul. God is a living, an individual and personal being, breathing forth power and spirituality, absolutely holy. He encourages the good. He deters the evil from evil ways. Without Him, the universe would become dead to moral beauty, and nature would die out. He is conscious with infinite attributes. But man is a finite personality, fallen, sinful, guilty, but susceptible of restoration. Christianity brings the mind in contact with the most vital subjects. Its principal ideas are God, man, holiness and sin; Christ, the Holy Spirit, regeneration, pardon, heaven and hell, and the awards and the retributions of eternity. Its grand mission is the restoration to God of the human soul, which is alienated from God, and wedded to the baser elements of itself, and of nature. It does this work through the instrumentality of these grand ideas, and by the agency of their Infinite Author. And we see its power in the fact that a single great thought continually revolved and considered, till realized in experience, results in the changing the inclinations of our nature; turns the will from the purposes of evil to the good, renews the spiritual life, and reforms the outer man. It is the glory of Christianity that it does not imprison the mind like the narrow teachings of paganism, or of naturalism, or the narrow conceptions of infidel philosophy, but that it opens the mind on a vast field of thought. This truth of God must be appropriated by the free action of the mind, that our duty to Him

may be fully realized. And to this end, the truths of Christ were addressed directly to the consciousness, which is the spiritual light, and the light in which and by which the soul beholds itself, its actions, contents and deserts. There is no light like it, and in and to and through this the truths of the gospel speak in no uncertain tones. And we are taught that we are to find the sum and the joys and work of life in all those duties which constitute a preparation for a higher and better life; working in the order and ways of providence with a loving heart.

There is the further idea that this personal God is a being who is to be worshiped as an infinitely holy and good being; the sum of perfection; but He is to be thanked, adored and worshiped in the home, and by the way-side, as well as in the stately temple, or in the majestic and hoary forest. We are to pray to Him with the full recognition of our filial and just relationship, and with a full and vital faith in Him as a person, and in His providential care. If this truth of God is appropriated by the free and loving action of the mind, and we realize our obligation to Him, and respond spontaneously, we shall be lifted above the depression of calamity, and rendered tranquil and serene, and be filled with a peaceful trust. We will love to meditate on the word and the ways of God; we will cherish a prayerful spirit and habit of mind, and hold our personal interests as trivial, compared with the duty of extending and establishing Christ's kingdom in the hearts of men. The soul requires some central point on which to rest; some basis of supply where it can recruit its wasted and impaired spiritual energy; some rallying point for its action and aim. This is found in Christ, the Perfect Pattern, and the only ideal ever found on the earth. When we turn from evil, we verge toward God, the author of our nature, to Christ the mediator and pattern; and the Holy Spirit is heeded, as the quickener of new life. Christianity "presents us in the life of our great Master, with an example of that moral perfection which is to be the object of our exertions. It is a most glorious display of the Deity, and of His care for the beings of this earth. It has lifted the vail which separated God from His creatures, and this life from eternity."

ARTICLE VI.—THE SAINTS OF ALL AGES.*

BY REV. D. LANTZ.

"And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."—*Hebrews xi. 39, 40.*

THIS, it is claimed, is one of the expressions of the Apostle Paul, which as Peter says, is hard to be understood. But this, like many other parts of the Scripture, is made to say what their author never intended to say. For we have some interpreters of Scripture, and especially of this text, which would almost induce one to say, about their hermeneutics, "Thou art weighed in the balance and art found wanting."

Paul is made responsible for what is here said, and yet there is but little evidence which goes to show that Paul ever wrote this or any other part of the letter to the Hebrews. The evidence that he did not write it greatly preponderates. This is, however, neither the time nor place to seek for the author of this anonymous epistle; its origin is evidently hidden somewhere under a mysterious veil.

Dr. Schaff, in speaking of its authorship, says, "It might be compared to the Melchisedec of its seventh chapter. For like this personage, it bears itself with priestly and kingly dignity and majesty, but is without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life."

It is evident that the author, whoever he may have been, had great confidence in the power of faith, for he commences the eleventh chapter of his epistle by saying that, "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen;"

* *The substance of a sermon preached by request, in the Reformed Church, at Forreston, Illinois.*

and then devotes the whole chapter in quoting subjects from among the Old Testament saints, showing what they accomplished by the power of faith.

"By faith," he says, "Enoch was translated, that he should not see death." Enoch's relationship with God was intimate, and he was so peculiarly favored, that his body was changed and rendered incorruptible, so that he might immediately enter the courts of the heavenly world without seeing death, or experiencing its sting. It is said that "he walked with God;" during this time he evidently received many tokens of the divine favor, and also some testimony that God was the rewarder of them that would diligently seek Him. And as this translation was something extraordinary, it was doubtless previously revealed to him, and also made known to his contemporaries.

Again: "By faith, Noah being warned of God of things not seen as yet, prepared an ark to the saving of his house." When God purposed to destroy the wicked antediluvians, he by some immediate revelation, made known his intention to Noah, and commanded him to prepare an ark in which he and his family should be saved. This was a "thing not seen as yet." Something like this never happened before, nor was there any sign in nature that would indicate any thing like a deluge, and the unbelieving doubtless concluded that such an event was impossible, and that God's goodness would not suffer Him to destroy the works of His own hands. But Noah was a righteous man, and had faith in the word of God; this faith was "an evidence of things not seen." He believed, and was sure that God would execute the sentence denounced by infinite justice, and that the deluge would come, and therefore showed his faith by his works, and "thereby became heir of the righteousness which is by faith."

And again: "By faith Moses refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter." Josephus tells us that "Moses had the promise of becoming the successor of Pharaoh on the throne of Egypt, if he would permit himself still to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter." "But by faith he forsook Egypt, not

fearing the wrath of the king." Although he had no army at his command by which he could defend himself against the wrath of the king, he had what he knew was mightier than the host of Pharaoh—because he had faith in God, which to him was sufficient evidence that he had a divine defender who would take care of him, and would deliver him. When he was therefore actually pursued he manifested no fear, but boldly encouraged the Israelites by saying, "Fear not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord." "The Lord shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace." His faith was to him also "the evidence of things not seen." The promises which God had made to Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob concerning the future of His people, were called up before him, by the power of his faith, and he could see them under the most cruel bondage, and the most abject condition, yet notwithstanding all the cruel treatment to which they would be subjected, he openly declared that he would go with them, "choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season."

Thus the author of this epistle goes on and gives the history of many others, showing the wonderful exploits which they performed by the power of their faith. While it enabled some to raise up even their dead, others were willing to suffer the most excruciating death, rather than to purchase life at so great a sacrifice. Now all these holy saints, and faithful believers of old, in consequence of their faith by which they were distinguished from the rest of mankind, it is said, "obtained a good report." Their faith, which of course produced its good works, gave them a good report in the Church, and brought them in favor with God. But just as their faith increased, and they thus increased in favor with God, they naturally grew in disfavor with the world, and the worshipers of idols.

And, yet, notwithstanding the power of their faith, by which they were enabled to do such wonderful exploits, it is said, "These all, having obtained a good report through faith, *received not the promise.*"

This has been called a mystery. That men so holy, and so entirely devoted to the Church all their lives should not be permitted to receive the promised Messiah, would at first view, indeed, seem a mystery. The mystery, after all, will however, not appear so inexplicable when seen in its true light. The author of this epistle does not intend to make the impression which some seem to receive from this text, that these early saints of the Church received no benefit from the advent of Christ into the world. Because the effect of the incarnation in the fulness of time looked both ways; the advent of the Redeemer was for the Jew no less than for the Gentile. It reached back to those ancient saints who lived in the twilight of the morning; they beheld its brightness, although in the distance, and were led to Him by faith. That "they received not the promise," does therefore not mean that they were not saved by grace through faith in the promised Messiah, just as well as we are saved by grace through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The promise which they received not, is something quite different. It rests altogether in a misapprehension of the fulfillment of the promise; although the time when the Redeemer would come was clearly indicated, already from the beginning, they did not seem to have had sufficient light to comprehend its meaning. These Old Testament saints, all of them, from the first promise of a Redeemer already in Eden, expected that they would live to see their deliverer in the flesh.

When Cain was born, it was but natural, therefore, for Eve to see in him already the fulfillment of the promise, hence she exclaimed, "I have gotten a man from the Lord." It was this that caused the marriage relation among the Jews to be held in most profound sacredness. Instances of divorce among them were a very rare thing. Because every Jewish family expected that the Messiah might be born in it. This expectation was the very life of every pious family in the glory of ancient Judaism. But the glory of the Jews passed away, and one family after another disappeared without realizing their expectations,—because they had no promise that they should all see the looked

for Messiah with their eyes of flesh. This did not, however, debar them from seeing him with their eyes of faith.

These ancient saints looked forward, and by faith in Christ received the promise before His incarnation, just as much as those who lived in the days of the Apostles, or those who live now, for it is alone "by grace through faith" that any are saved, either in the Jewish or Christian dispensation. For it must be remembered that "the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world."

Potentially Christ was offered as a sacrifice before the worlds were made; the world was made for Christ, and not Christ for the world. The maker was before the thing made. "All things were not only made by Him, but also to Him and for Him."

Again: We are told, "*God having provided some better thing for us.*"—This is also a mystery, we are told. Why we should be considered worthy of something better than those ancient Jewish saints seems to some inexplicable. But in the attempt to give us light on this mystery, some of the expositors have only heaped more rubbish upon it, and buried it deeper in the mist, and obscured it more from view than the author himself. Would it not be a still greater mystery if this were otherwise? It would indeed be a most miserable comment for the Church and for the cause of Christianity in general, if there had been no improvement, or progress during the four thousand years of its history which preceded the Christian dispensation. Even the world would consider it a disparagement if we would say that it had not made any improvement during all this time. Every department in nature, each one in its own sphere, is perpetually developing and unfolding itself; and is therefore consequently ever actively engaged in contributing its part to assist in the general and grand mission of the world. The idea is very common that there is no relation between the Church and the world; this is a mistake. In so far as the present is concerned the two are inseparable. The world is the reflection of the Church, or it may be said that the kingdom of the world is a shadow of which the kingdom of grace is the reality. The world

is not a mere abstraction, standing entirely disunited with any thing higher than nature; but it is an indispensable factor called into existence by the unfolding of a divine idea, and the kingdom of nature was just as fully represented in the person of Christ as the kingdom of grace. He took upon Himself the nature of man, and man being the sum total or the ultimate of all nature, Christ therefore in taking upon Himself that nature comprehended in it the entire natural universe; and when Christ or the Word was thus made flesh, John says: "And we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Christ therefore now stands before us comprehending in Himself all things both in the kingdom of nature and in the kingdom of grace. The great progress, therefore, so manifest in the arts and sciences, and in literature, is but the reflection of the divine nature of the kingdom of grace, which is being gradually more fully established. The divine or inner life of the Church was not at once fully and completely established in the world's state of infancy. The world was not then sufficiently developed to receive the supernatural, hence we have this gradual and progressive development. The same idea is clearly foreshadowed in the incarnation of our Lord. Christ became known to us only as He revealed Himself through His humanity. The infant babe in the manger in Bethlehem did not reveal the glory which He had with the Father, as clearly as at His transfiguration on the mount. After He had assumed the human, His divine nature gradually, but continually entered and illuminated it as it grew in stature, and into manhood. Hence we have the human nature of Christ all the way through the history of His entire earthly life more fully before our eyes, while His divine nature is for the most part hid behind the human, and seen only by the eyes of our faith. And yet there were instances when the divine was sometimes clearly perceptible through the human. We must, however, not suffer ourselves to attribute any thing like imperfection to the Son of man during His suffering and death upon the cross. For when looked at from a divine stand-

point, we can safely say that through all His eventful life, and in His many conflicts with the powers of darkness He was already potentially glorified. Humanly speaking, therefore, the close of His earthly life was much more glorious than His infancy, or yet His childhood. For four thousand years the world was in a state of preparation for the reception of the Word in human flesh; during all this time there was a gradual unfolding of the approaching sun as the great central light of the universe. And yet all that transpired thus seemingly in the way of preparation, was only the expansion of that plan which dwelt in the infinite wisdom of the world's Redeemer. And then during the natural lifetime of our Lord, we have, in His history, the entire Church of the future typified in all its different stages, even up to its final glorification. Nearly two thousand years of its subsequent history, thus typified, have already passed by, showing that its central power is the eternal Word Himself.

Having therefore the history of the life of Christ as a type of the Church's future, we must not expect that the individuals composing that Church will be just what their predecessors were; but each one will go on from a lower to a higher state, until they have Christ formed in them. And what is in this respect true of the individual Christian, is also true of the Church as the body of Christ. And the Church as the body of Christ is a living body, and as such can therefore not be stationary for a moment, nor can it be expected that, as an organic body, it will ever continue to repeat the same lesson. There is a continual developing process, or an evolution, not of such a nature, however, as will destroy its general type. The oak of the forest may have stood there for centuries, and have continually changed ever since its sprout came forth from the acorn, and yet notwithstanding the many changes, it continues the same tree still; that is, it is the same tree as to species, acquiring however constantly a more vigorous life, and also qualities of a higher order. Carrying always with it, that which was in possibility contained in the germ of the acorn.

In like manner the Church is ever changing, and yet ever the same, carrying with it into a higher life always that which it had gathered in a lower. Thus adding the growth and the improvement of every age to her history, until it has arrived at its full perfection in Christ Jesus.

Every organic life process has a history, and the end of such process is always comprehended in the beginning; hence the end is the actualization of that which is potentially contained in the beginning.

To illustrate, we have three different periods in the history of man. Infancy, or childhood, youth, and manhood. Here the man is potentially in the child, and the child is also developed into manhood.

Thus we have the childhood, the youth, and the manhood in the historic development of the Church. There is the Abrahamic, generally called the patriarchal period, which may well be regarded as the childhood, on account of its comparative innocence. The consequences of sin were as yet not fully developed; although constitutionally there, the age in which they lived did not seem to have any thing sufficiently exciting to awaken them. The government was a theocracy, like that of a father over his child. The patriarch walked before God, in the beauty and the simplicity of a childlike faith. There was no necessity for any fixed code of laws to punish the offender; because wickedness was not yet fully grown.

A very different scene presents itself in the history of man with the introduction of the Mosaic dispensation. The child has become a youth, the race has outgrown its childhood, and with the disappearing of the childhood, the childlike innocence and disposition have also disappeared. The native wickedness common to the race is beginning to assume an aggressive attitude, parental authority is ignored, "and the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."

This disobedience now necessitated a law, not any longer a law of love; but of terror, so that through it the justice of God

as well as the love of God, might be clearly seen. Hence we have the law which has been called the "fiery law," given on Mount Sinai to Moses amidst thunderings, and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the smoking of the mountain.

Being under the curse of the law, in consequence of sin, the youth vainly struggles against its rigor, being now made conscious of its terror to evil doers, of which he was almost entirely ignorant in his childhood.

In the childhood of the race, when the affections were tender, and the love of God was sufficient to command obedience, He revealed Himself as the God of love, but now that His love is no longer respected, His justice is also made known. In looking now from the standpoint of God's justice, the love of God appears most lovely. But, although the law with its fearful threatening, and its rigor was introduced for the purpose of teaching the youth subjection and obedience to the will of his heavenly Father, it was not only a teacher to correct and to chastise for disobedience, but it was also a schoolmaster to lead him to Christ to learn of Him.

When, therefore, the fullness of time came, and Christ the Son of God came, and entered, not only into our world, but also into our human nature, it was then that the true manhood of the race began. However lovely the relation which existed between God and man during the comparatively innocent childlike and patriarchal period, it was as yet immeasurably short of what it was originally meant to be in its final perfection. But in order to reach that perfection, it had first to pass through these preparatory stages. The filial relation which then existed, and which was almost entirely hid from view during the Mosaic dispensation, was not only restored to full consciousness; but in the person of the Godman, it now forces itself more directly and deeper upon the Church's full-grown manhood, than it did in that infantine period. Since Christ Himself has now taught the Church, in its full-grown manhood, to look up and address God as "Our Father which art in heaven," His love once more returns with deeper tones, conveying to the child a true bless-

edness coming forth from the bosom of the Father. Here new the love of the Father which was so freely exercised towards the Church in its childhood, and the justice which was revealed to Moses in the law, and which was given for the youth meet, and in the full-grown manhood of the Church, which is only fully comprehended in the person of the Godman Christ Jesus, the two meet each other. Each one now acknowledges the other's true and legitimate authority. The justice which was then considered as very grievous to be borne, is now indeed felt to be but the manifestation of love, and the love which was then only seen as lovely, is now also felt to be truly just. •

Looking, therefore, thus at this subject in the light of history, and hence are now able to see the more excellent glory which we possess in Christ, or in the Christian dispensation and the Church's full-grown manhood, may it not with great propriety be said that "God has provided some better thing for us?" It is not now any longer the mere shadow reflected dimly from the distant future; but the substance itself, not anticipation, but actual possession. That which to them was but the idea, has to us become the idea and the fact united into an eternal reality.

In that morning of the Church's history, when men strained their eyes of faith, which were then, at best, but weak, to catch some bright rays of hope from the distant rising sun, and when they, in their far off pre-Christian period struggled to become Christians before the advent of Christ, and the birth of the Christian Church, they could not comprehend the peculiar glory of Christ and His kingdom, which we now possess in the Gospel dispensation, enjoying as we do the noonday glory of the Son of Righteousness.

Since the angel of Mercy has rolled away the stone from the sepulchre, and thus brought forth the Church's Easter morning, leaving nothing but an empty tomb to the cold and Christless world, there is now a risen and glorious head of the chosen race, whose effulgent rays reflected back and constituted the morning twilight of the Abrahamic period of the Church; but

which reveals to us a fuller and a more complete insight into the deep mystery of that Easter morning.

When we now stand by the side of that open and deserted tomb, and hear the angel say, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen," it dispels the gloom of that long and dreary night-time, and unfolds the light and warmth of the Sun of righteousness. It is beneath the balmy influences of this effulgent sun that men go forth preaching Him who was dead, but has shown Himself alive by many infallible proofs.

What a far more glorious aspect does the Christian Church, which is the living body of Christ, under its new dispensation, now present in its full-grown manhood, than either in its Abrahamic childhood, or its Mosaic youth. That which those ancient saints could only conceive, but could not realize;—which they then felt after, but could not reach, and which they dreamed about, but when they awoke found that it was only a dream, all this we now have as a living fact.

Again, we are told in the text, "God having provided some better thing for us, that *they without us should not be made perfect.*"

This is also claimed to be another *mystery*. But, like the others, this mystery has been made more mysterious by much learning, and arbitrary conclusions drawn from false premises. The mystery of the text itself is by no means as great and as incomprehensible as the hermeneutics of some of its expositors.

When we hear such men as Chrysostom, a pious and highly educated Church father of the fourth century say, when commenting on the old Testament saints mentioned in the context, "All these from Abel to Noah have not received their crown, God has appointed a time so that they cannot be crowned before us," we wonder whether he expects that we should receive his views unhesitatingly, and be satisfied to rest our hopes of a blissful immortality on a philosophy so cold and cheerless as this. A subject which is so intimately connected with our future destiny, so far-reaching in its effects, and which has stirred

the bosom of humanity in all ages, and among all nations from the beginning, is worthy of a more scriptural conclusion.

Theodorotus, bishop of Cyprus, also of the fourth century says, "These have not received their crown, because God is waiting for those who are still fighting the battles of the Lord, so that He might declare them all at once as conquerors."

Gregane says, "You see that Abraham has as yet to obtain the perfection, yes and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets are still waiting for us, in order that they with us may obtain the everlasting life."

Still another says, "Even the apostles themselves have not obtained their joy, but are waiting, so that *we* may also be fellow heirs with them."

Now, if the interpretation here given, of the text by these theologians is correct, then, reasoning from the same premises, the natural conclusion must be that all these holy church fathers, the apostles, the Old Testament saints, together with the saints of all ages, have as yet not obtained their joy, but are still waiting, so that *we* too may also become fellow heirs with them.

If, now, what is here said of the disembodied spirits of the saints would have been said of their bodies, we should not be likely to find any objection, because the bodies of the saints of all ages will, beyond a doubt, rest in the grave till the final resurrection, when they shall be raised together, and each one again reinhabited by its own soul. But to speak thus of the spirits of the departed saints is, to say the least of it, contrary to the entire teaching of the Scriptures. And to claim that the spirits of all the holy patriarchs, prophets, the apostles and martyrs shall remain in an unconscious state until the final consummation of all things, and that the spirits of the just shall not be made perfect until after the last saint shall have departed this life, would involve us in an inextricable difficulty.

But the terms *soul* and *spirit* are so mixed up and used to mean one and the same thing, even among many theologians,

so that when either term is used it is difficult to determine what is meant, or how we are to apply it. When God formed man out of the dust of the earth, He at the same time breathed in him the breath of life, and he thus became a living soul, but not a living spirit. "The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." The soul is a part of the original man, and is therefore just as natural and as common to all men as the body, and we might just as well speak of a man without a body as of a man without a soul. The spirit as used in regard to the regenerated man is something very different from the soul, and is not an original part of man. Had man not fallen the case might perhaps be different; but in his fallen state there is nothing left in man capable of being fitted for eternal glory, without the power from God. Hence we have the emphatic declaration of Christ to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born *from above*." This being born from above means something more than merely some kind of a change of the soul being produced through the mere instrumentality of man. A religious excitement, however long the meeting may be protracted, falls immeasurably short of being able to produce what is meant by being born from above. Holy Ghost, Holy Spirit, and Spirit of God as used in our translation, are all used to denote a being or power altogether foreign to man in his state of nature. These different terms are all a translation from the same Greek word, *Pneuma*. When Christ charged His disciples to "go and teach all nations," He also commanded them to baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the *Pneumatos*, the Holy Ghost. Here the Holy Ghost is regarded as the third person of the Godhead, and also as being equal to the Father and the Son. The term *Pneuma* is used eighty-four different times in the Greek Testament, and in every instance means the third person of the Godhead. This *Pneuma*, Holy Ghost, or Spirit, is a gift which is represented as being communicated to certain persons under certain circumstances. He is also the Comforter whom our Lord promised to send after His departure from His disciples.

It must, however, not be inferred from this that the Spirit was not in the hearts of the believers before the ascension of Christ; because God said already to Israel of old, "I will put my Spirit within you." And then, after His resurrection, and before His ascension, when Christ met with His disciples, He breathed upon them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." And then at the Pentecost, when the Christian Church was fully established, the Holy Ghost descended in a visible form, taking possession as the ruling power in it, with the promise also that He would never leave or forsake it.

Although the Spirit thus entered the Church, and will remain in it perpetually in a general way, to supervise and control it, He is also more directly in the soul of the individual believer. Thus, when the people were pricked to their hearts by the preaching of Peter on the day of Pentecost, and asked what they should do, "they were told to "repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and they should receive the gift of the *Pneumatos, Holy Ghost*." Of Elizabeth it was said she was "filled with the Holy Ghost." "His father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost." The disciples were instructed to look out among themselves seven men of honest report, and full of the Holy Ghost, to attend to the alms of the Church. Stephen was one of these seven, of whom it is said afterwards that he was full of the Holy Ghost. But we need not add any more texts of this kind, because the reader of the Scriptures knows that there is no want of evidence on this subject. The Holy Ghost is therefore the *Pneuma*, Spirit, in the soul of the believer. Paul asks, "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?"

This Spirit is spoken of as something in the soul, not by natural birth, but as something coming from without, and being put there by being born from above. Hence the Saviour says, "Marvel not that I said unto thee Ye must be born *from above*." And again, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in

heaven." "And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him; but ye know Him, for He dwelleth with you, *and shall be in you.*"

If, then, the Spirit of the saints is the Spirit of God, can it be presumed that these spirits will rest in an unconscious state till time shall be no more? Or will it be claimed that such a spirit can become unconscious?

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews gives us an entirely different idea of the abode of these departed spirits. "But ye," he says, "are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels. To the general assembly and Church of the first born which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect." These came not only to the souls, but also to the spirits of the *just men made perfect.*

The idea that the spirits of the saints will pass into an unconscious state for a long period of time is a cold and cheerless philosophy. It is not at all in harmony with what we look for, by the kind invitations of our Lord to come unto Him. He passed through the grave, ascended to the right hand of God the Father, and told His disciples that where He is there they should be also. That idea is contrary to the entire current of the Scriptures, for they, all the way through, from first to last, declare that, "To be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord," and "Blessed *are* the dead which die in the Lord." And John, when on the Isle of Patmos, was permitted to look into the inner courts of the heavenly Jerusalem, not only to behold the saints in glory, but he was allowed to enter into conversation with them. He saw twenty-four elders seated on as many seats, and he asked, "Whence are these?" and was told, "These are they that came up out of great tribulation." Were not these four and twenty elders some of those who, for the sake of their faith, suffered such great tribulation

and martyrdom, as described by the writer in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews?

Now, what meaning could there be in the account which John gives of the place of the sainted dead, or those other texts just quoted, if all the patriarchs and prophets, the apostles and martyrs, and the saints of all ages, are still soul, body and spirit, somewhere in an imperfect, or perhaps in an unconscious state?

Again, if the spirits of the saints still sleep, or are in any way imperfect, and are consequently waiting to be made perfect, then it cannot be that they, during their earthly lifetime, had received the Spirit of God. Because that Spirit, being the Spirit of God, precludes at once the possibility of any imperfection, or the addition of any thing by the apostles, that would enhance their felicity. That the soul will be susceptible of a higher degree of glory after the resurrection of the body, and the re-union of soul and body, is readily admitted, but that does not necessarily imply any imperfection on the part of the spirit. The Spirit of God takes up His abode in the soul of man after a full and complete preparation, which is accomplished through the proper use of the means of grace. When the multitude were convinced of their sins by the preaching of the law by the apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost, they asked, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" They were told to "repent and be baptized, every one of them, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sin, *and they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*"

As this sermon by Peter was the first gospel sermon preached by any of the apostles, and that too just at the birth of the Christian Church, and as this whole Pentecostal miracle was superintended and dictated by the Holy Ghost Himself, these words, though spoken by Peter, were nevertheless the words of the Holy Ghost, and were intended to be the foundation of the doctrine of the Christian Church for all future time. So that now we have here a sure evidence, coming directly from God Himself; and hence, when He says, "I will put my Spirit

within you," He must mean a supernatural spirit. The Spirit of God was the regenerating power in the regeneration of the Jewish Church, and after its regeneration He took up His perpetual abode in it as the Christian Church. Just so in the regeneration of the individual. We have a repeating of the Pentecostal miracle, though on a small scale, in the case of every soul that is regenerated. The Holy Ghost recreates, or regenerates, through the preaching of the gospel, and then takes up His perpetual abode in it.

Now, then, although these sainted Jews were not made perfect without us, as we are told in the text, yet there is no reason why we should come to the unnatural conclusion that they are not in just as high a state of glory as even the angels themselves. Yea, we have reason to believe that they are even much higher, for Christ, after His resurrection, ascended far above all powers and principalities, even to the right hand of God the Father, and told His disciples that where He was there they should be also. And to the thief on the cross He said, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Hence, if they are above the angels, with Christ in the immediate presence of God the Father, where the perfection itself dwells, what higher perfection can there be possible?

The reason why it is said that these saints were not made perfect without the apostles is found to be something quite different. They were saved, and they were saved by the same plan of salvation that the apostles and all the saints in the Christian dispensation were, for there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby any can be saved but the name of Jesus. But they were saved by the anticipated efficacy of the sacrifice. It was only in and through Jesus Christ, and that by sharing those benefits which were first openly and fully revealed to the apostles, and were therefore not known until at the founding of the Christian dispensation. Until then they were not complete in their salvation.

As long, therefore, as that which was better, and which God had provided for us was unknown, it was really not provided,

in so far as man was concerned. And as there is no past or future with God, this mode of expression is here used to adapt itself to our power of comprehension. Hence it could therefore well be said, that the saints of the Old Testament could not be made perfect without the saints of the new economy. Not, however, because the saints of the new dispensation themselves will add anything that will make them more perfect. This is not what is meant by the better thing which the apostles had, but rather the better thing was not made known till the time of the apostles.

Christ Himself only could bring the perfection of our salvation to light, and not until the fullness of time had come. This revelation had to be made to the Apostolic Church, and through the Gospel. As there could be no Gospel, and also no apostles until after the advent of Christ, it is very obvious why their perfection and also the perfection of the saints of all ages was only fully perfected in the time of the apostles.

There could be but one Christmas, and also but one Good Friday, and one Easter; and hence the efficacy of these three events reach back to the beginning of time just as well as forward to the end of time. Christmas and Easter were, "*once for all.*" Our parents taught us already in our childhood to say, "I believe in the communion of saints."

Now this "communion of saints," and "Holy Catholic Church," is the something better which "God has provided for us." But "*the something better*" is here used comparatively, implying that the Jewish saints had something of the same nature, or at least something good. As regards the communion of saints, we of course know but little up to the time of the gospel period, for it was only then that the light made it manifest; but it was, however, clearly foreshadowed already from the beginning. This is a part of the very nature of man; he was created a social being. "It is not good that the man should be alone." Hence this fellowship, or communion of man, is an institution from God. The family relation, which is the first order of all society, is a divine institution, and yet is

in perfect accordance with the will of man, because "God works in him both to will and to do." He is also the "author of our faith." The next order of society, and on a more extensive plan, is that of state, or still more extensive, that of nation. But as the family is composed of individual members, so the state is made up of individual families. In like manner the nation is also made up by the individual states, so on to the end. And as the whole is always conditioned by its parts, it follows that as the individual families are, so will be the state; and as the individual members, so will be the family.

But beyond all these there is another association of an infinitely higher order, one too standing more intimately connected with the spirit world, the effects of which will run parallel with eternity. Although this association, or rather church, seems to be last in point of revealed history, it nevertheless in point of fact dates back to the first human family, and as an organic body from the beginning reaches out in all time, comprehending the saints of all ages as one brotherhood. Although the Church, in its first or infant state was but dimly seen, it was nevertheless reflected in the family relation, and was also then, no less than now, the Church of God and the bride of the same bridegroom. But even in this family fellowship, however innocent, there was felt to be something wanting; there was a longing after something better, something that the home love could not satisfy, neither could the association of state furnish the felt want. The soul seemed to say within itself, "God having provided some better thing for us." It looks for some one to come and roll away the stone from the sepulchre, so that it could see the "*Desire of all nations.*" This desire of the soul was an ever-recurring prelude of Him for whom all the world looked. Thus with this kind of a strange home-sickness, one generation after another passed away, each one vainly looking for and often asking, "Art thou He that should come, or look we for another?"

It was alone in the fullness of time, the idea of a new dispensation, the bright and morning star that could satisfy the

soul. In Him we for the first time behold the universal law, that reaches back and comprehends all that after which patriarchs and prophets and all the holy men from Abel sighed. Christ now puts an end to the long-cherished Jewish idea, that they alone should look for the Messiah. As the King of kings and Lord of lords, He revealed His kingdom as a universal kingdom, extending to all nations, and to all time, and He Himself as the head of the race, and consequently also of the Church as His body.

Thus, then, it will be seen that the order in which we appear is that of progression. First the family, then the state, and last the Church. We look naturally for the germ, then the tree, and finally the fruit. But this is not really the fact, it is rather only the order in which it is revealed to us. The germ is not before the tree, neither is the tree before the fruit; because both the tree and the fruit are already in possibility in the germ.

We have already said, that in every organic life process the end is always potentially comprehended in the beginning; the child is the man, only as yet undeveloped. So it is also not only a member of the family, but already in possibility a member of the fellowship of the state, and hence also no less a member of the Church; and as such, therefore, already in its infancy in a living fellowship with Christ.

Here now we may see, to some extent, the relation brought to view in our text, between us and the saints of the Jewish Church. Just as that which was in the child was not seen until in process of time, and in the providence of God it was revealed, so the perfection of the old testament saints was only gradually revealed, but not fully in all their peculiarities until "Christ brought life and immortality to light in the Gospel."

We must not therefore run into the error so common, and in which some seem to delight, as another expresses it, "of painting the old world black for the purpose of bringing out, as by a dark back-ground, the brightness and glory of the new." There is no credit due any historian who attempts to take that

which belongs to one period of time, and place it to the credit of another period to which he may belong, for the purpose of thus claiming the greater praise to himself. The true historian is simply the recorder, and not the maker of history, hence he will give facts and dates as history makes them, and not as he might wish them to be. It is disparaging to the good name of the Old Testament saints in denying to them that which is noble, true, and vastly to their credit, and calling them something else simply for selfish ends. It would have been a pitiful comment indeed on the integrity and honesty of the light, when God said, "Let there be light, and there was light," if that light would have entirely ignored the chaos out of which it was called. For if there had not first been a chaos and darkness there could not have been light and order. Who can tell how much the patriarchal period had to do, and how much moral darkness the Mosaic government had to dispel to make room for the advent of the Gospel. Here, too, God had to say, "Let there be light," and out of the confusion came order, and out of the darkness came forth light. Because we are now full-grown men we must not despise our childhood, nor deny that we were a child. We are still what we were then, only the child developed. Just as the chaos stands related to the subsequent light and order, or the child to the man, so the Jewish saints stand related to the saints of the Christian dispensation. The material of the Christian Church was mostly furnished and prepared by the ages which went before, but their full development and perfection was only completed in the fullness of time, so that the whole Church, from first to last, comprehending all time, might be perfected in *one body*, as the body of Christ, or in the language of the Apostolic Creed, "the holy Catholic Church."

Hence the saints of the Old Testament dispensation, mentioned in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, as not having received the promise, and could not be made perfect without us, were nevertheless all perfectly holy, and entered into the joys of their Lord immediately at death, and were consequently

with the angels of heaven in eternal glory long before any of the apostles were born.

The author of the letter to the Hebrews does not intend to convey the idea that those ancient holy men were not already perfectly holy; but that they did not and could not obtain their perfection through the deeds of the law, because "by the deeds of the law no flesh could be justified," and hence the law could make nothing perfect. "The holy men under the old dispensation," says another, "are perfectly righteous, perfectly holy, and perfectly glorified; but their perfection was not by the law."

These ancient saints, therefore, obtained their perfection just as the apostles and all the New Testament saints did, only through the atoning sacrifice of Christ. Because their sins and ours were all washed away by the same blood which was shed for the sins of the whole world. So that their righteousness and ours is not our own, but it is the righteousness of Christ which they and we had to appropriate to ourselves by our faith in Christ.

They and we now are therefore made to constitute the one body of Christ, of which Christ Himself is the head. That, although the members constituting that body have been scattered throughout all the ages of time and nations of the earth, they are yet perfected in one body by virtue of their union with Christ. So that they do not now appear in separate divisions as a holy Catholic Jewish, and also a holy Catholic Christian Church. It has therefore been the song of the saints of all ages, "I believe in the holy Catholic Church, and in the communion of saints." Thus they and we together, soul, body, and spirit, as one universal Church, will forever be glorified alike.

ART. VII.—WOMAN PREACHING VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF
GOD'S WORD AND CHURCH HISTORY.

BY REV. CYRUS CORT.

THE right of woman to preach and pray in public before promiscuous assemblies has always been denied by the great body of orthodox and evangelical Christendom. The Quakers have had a majority of female preachers for several generations. The Unitarians and Universalists have shown special favor toward the innovation. It was estimated two years ago that about one hundred female preachers and evangelists were then laboring in different parts of the United States, and chiefly among the heterodox sects just mentioned.

The spirit of the times seems rather favorable to the innovation. Denominations which were inflexibly opposed to the ministrations of women in the sanctuary a generation ago are beginning to relax in the vigor of their prohibition, and now countenance public speaking and praying of women in a way that would have scandalized our orthodox forefathers. The question arises, are we wiser on this subject than the ancients or are we countenancing a dangerous innovation by recognizing the right of women to preach, pray and exhort before promiscuous assemblies? For my own part I am obliged to adopt the latter alternative. After a careful examination of the subject in the light of God's word I am compelled to endorse most emphatically the deliverance of the Presbyterian Church on this topic in 1832. "Meetings of pious women by themselves for conversation and prayer we entirely approve. But let not the inspired prohibition of the great Apostle, as found in his epis-

tle to the Corinthians and to Timothy be violated. To teach and to exhort or to lead us in prayer, in public promiscuous assembly, is clearly forbidden to women in the holy oracles."

Whether or not our Presbyterian friends are consistently maintaining that position in all their congregations we are not prepared to decide just now. But of one thing we feel confident, viz.: It is the only position which can be successfully maintained in the light of God's word and the history of the Church of Jesus Christ.

Woman preaching and praying in promiscuous assemblies is a modern and unscriptural innovation and a perversion of Apostolic and Christian usages. As such it can only be injurious in its ultimate results.

The Ohio Synod of the Reformed Church in 1842 formally disapproved of women praying aloud in promiscuous assemblies or prayer meetings.

St. Paul was the champion of evangelical freedom, the most progressive and liberal of all the Apostles. He vindicated the right of the Gentile converts to be incorporated into the Church of the New Testament without first passing through the portals of Judaism.

If Christianity was to mark a new departure from the established customs of the Jewish Church on this subject St. Paul would have been pre-eminently the one to enunciate and emphasize the new departure. But where do we find the great Apostle of the Gentiles ranging himself on this question? Not in favor of the right of women to preach or pray in public religious services. On the other hand his epistles furnish the classic passages on the opposite side.

Nothing could be more explicit and emphatic than the teachings of St. Paul on this subject. "Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak. * * It is a shame for women to speak in the church." "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. I suffer not a woman to teach or usurp authority over the man but to be in silence." See 1 Cor. 14, 34: &c. 1 Tim. 2: 11, &c. We

could not prohibit women from preaching in language more plain and positive than that here employed by the Apostle Paul.

He positively forbids women from preaching or speaking in public promiscuous assemblies of the church. If we believe in the inspiration of St. Paul and that the New Testament must be taken as our infallible guide in matters of Christian faith and practice we must oppose woman preaching as a dangerous innovation. Few have the hardihood to call in question the plain meaning of the passages just quoted as they stand by themselves and in their connexion. But there are some professing Christians who try to break the force of these passages by quoting others, which they suppose relate to the same subject. They violate fundamental rules of scriptural interpretation and throw discredit upon the Apostolic teaching by striving to prove that St. Paul allows in one place what he repeatedly forbids in other places. Distinct and positive passages must always rule the meaning of passages that are vague, indirect and doubtful in their meaning and application.

Thus when Paul tells us in the eleventh chapter of First Corinthians that "every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head," we are not to infer as some do that Paul admits the right of woman to pray and prophesy or preach provided she has proper covering for her head. If that were a correct and necessary inference then St. Paul would flatly contradict, in the 14th chapter of this epistle, what he taught or permitted in the eleventh, and the whole question would be involved in confusion.

Paul was not so careless or unsound a reasoner as that. His writings, on this point especially, are in all respects logical and consistent. If we read the eleventh chapter carefully we will see that he nowhere teaches or admits that it is right and proper for woman to pray or prophesy in public promiscuous assemblies either with or without a veil or covering to her head. He says that even nature teaches that it is unbecoming for her to pray or prophesy with uncovered head, but he does not say or admit that she has a right to pray or prophesy at all in the

church. He is there discussing more particularly the matter of dress and the relation of the sexes and not the matter of preaching itself. It was an utter violation of the rules of modesty and female subordination for a woman to pray or prophesy publicly in that manner. Afterwards in the fourteenth chapter, when he comes to the subject of preaching itself and the conduct of public worship, he emphatically forbids woman to speak in the church at all, and declares in the next verse that "It is a shame for woman to speak in the church."

Calvin compares 1 Cor., 11: 4, with 1 Cor., 14: 34, &c., and significantly remarks *apostolus unum improbando alterum non probat*. In condemning the one thing the Apostle does not approve of the other. In censuring particularly the form and manner of the act he does not thereby necessarily say or admit that the act itself would be right and proper under any circumstances. For instance, a minister might say that it is very unbecoming for a set of men or boys to come stalking along the church aisle engaged in boisterous conversation with their hats on during divine service. By such a remark he would not admit that it would be right and proper for them to engage in such conversation with their hats off. So St. Paul, in condemning women for praying and preaching with uncovered head, does not admit their right to pray or preach at all in promiscuous assemblies.

The passage in the 11th chapter does not contradict or modify the emphatic and distinct deliverance in the 14th chapter.

Obscure and doubtful passages must always be explained and understood in the light of passages that are plain and unmistakable in their meaning. It is irreverent trifling with the word of God to try to set aside such passages as 1 Cor. 14: 34, etc., 1 Tim., 2: 11, etc., with no better scriptural warrant for so doing than a mere inference drawn from an argument relating to another subject. And that is what the advocates of woman preaching are constantly doing. The practice of both the Jewish and Christian Church fully accords with the teachings of St.

Paul. If there was any doubt in regard to the meaning of language so plain Church history furnishes a practical commentary. Women were never allowed to officiate as ministers of the gospel by any of the orthodox and historical denominations. Women could only enter the outer court of the Temple under the Jewish economy. They never dared to enter the court of the priests where sacrifice and incense were offered by the anointed servants of the Lord. Miriam, the talented and ambitious sister of Aaron and Moses, once undertook to perform some sort of priestly functions in public, see Numbers 12. But she was smitten with leprosy in the very act and banished from the camp seven days. The Lord only healed her in response to the prayer of Moses, whose official character she had disputed.

In the synagogue worship women were never allowed to enter the main part of the sanctuary much less were they allowed to officiate as leaders in the public worship of the great Jehovah. Huldah, Deborah, Anna and the four daughters of Philip are said to have prophesied. They are extraordinary and exceptional cases. In thousands of years among hundreds of millions of God's covenant people a few rare cases of women acting as prophets are mentioned. And we are not informed precisely in regard to the manner of exercising their prophetic talents. One thing is certain, however, that it was done in a comparatively private way without violating the strict rules regulating public worship in the temple, synagogue and Christian sanctuary.

The Jews did not permit women to speak or ask questions in their public assemblies. Hence there was no need to give special prohibitions to Jewish converts as there was to Greek converts on the subject of women preaching. The fearful judgment which came upon Miriam was a solemn warning to Hebrew women throughout all generations "not to usurp authority," which the Almighty in infinite wisdom had entrusted to man as head of the family and official leader in the church. See Numbers 12: 1, etc., Deut 24: 8-9.

Among all the gracious acts and words of Jesus in behalf of

woman it is significant that He nowhere authorizes them to preach or officiate as public ministers of the gospel. There was no woman among the 70 disciples whom He sent out to proclaim the kingdom of heaven to be at hand. There was no woman among the 12 Apostles. So far as the common blessings and privileges of the gospel are concerned there is in Christ Jesus neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female. All stand upon a common platform of gracious privilege. But the case is different as regards the official or representative functions of the gospel ministry. For wise reasons the Lord forbids woman from arrogating or usurping these. It will not do to affirm as some do that Paul's prohibition was only temporary and intended merely to apply to ignorant and fanatical converts just emerging from heathenism. He makes no exception even in writing to communities embracing among their female members such devoted and intelligent women as Phœbe and Priscilla.

We believe that the Apostles of our Lord, and that St. Paul in particular was inspired by the Holy Ghost to lay broad and deep the practical, doctrinal and ethical foundations of our holy religion.

All legitimate progress must be in the line of consistency with their acts and teachings. No age can outgrow or be absolved from obedience to the great principles of Christian faith and practice laid down by St. Paul.

St. Peter says that in the epistles of St. Paul are some things hard to be understood which those who are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do the other Scriptures, to their own destruction. Certainly the position of Paul on the question of woman's right to officiate or take a leading part in public services of the sanctuary is not one of those things that are hard to be understood. Plain and explicit, clear and unmistakable, are his deliverances on this point. Moreover, he tells us expressly that on this head he communicates the commandments of the Lord, and further, that all genuine prophetic or spiritual-minded persons will admit this fact. See 1 Cor. 14: 37.

Whether or not we can understand the grounds or propriety of his emphatic prohibition of women praying or speaking in Christian assemblies, certain it is that such is his teaching, not merely in incidental or inferential form, but in the most explicit and didactic terms. Nor is it merely a local or temporary advice, but a general and permanent prohibition for all lands and for all times.

It is the part of duty and wisdom for us to bow in faithful submission to the oracles of the living God. It is no answer to say that women preachers have many seals to their ministry. Bad men are often very successful in making converts by resorting to sensational appliances. Mormon evangelists even are said to produce the same phenomena among the ignorant populace in England, Wales, etc., that frequently attend the ministrations of enthusiastic revivalists in Christian and American communities. The devil himself at times puts on the garb of an angel of light. Success in the popular sense of the term is not a criterion of truth and right. Impostors are frequently most successful as the world goes. It is required of a man and especially of a minister of Christ that he be found faithful, faithful to the claims of truth and duty amid good and evil report. The meed of genuine success may seem to be withheld for a season by the Judge of the earth. But in the end He will do right and render to each and all according to their works. The Quakers have had numerous female preachers and exhorters, but every one of the old historical orthodox denominations have flourished more than the Quaker sect, although the orthodox bodies obeyed the injunction of the great Apostle and forbade women to speak in the church.

Whatever is clearly Scriptural is right and for the best interests of society, whether we can fully understand it or not.

Our appeal should be to the law and testimony. If a man speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in him. Sentimental feelings and preconceived notions must be laid on the altar of our common Lord and Saviour. Christianity has done great things for woman and woman has done great

things for Christianity. Her true welfare and safety are to be found in imitating the pious and modest example of the godly matrons of old rather than in presumptuously pressing into positions in Church and State which God and nature never intended that she should occupy. Nor have we yet found any trouble in impressing these facts upon sensible, pious, orthodox women. There is plenty of room for all faithful female helpers in the vineyard of the Lord, without violating any Apostolic injunction. They are the best friends of woman who honestly and earnestly point out the path which divine wisdom has made for her to walk in. The great need of our age and country is mothers, pious, Christian mothers who will be "keepers at home," see Titus 2: 5, and bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, who will cultivate the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price, rather than adorn themselves with gold or pearls or costly array, or seek to usurp authority given to man.

ART. VIII.—GOD IN CHRIST.

BY THE EDITOR.

THAT theology has changed its *standpoint* since the Reformation is now coming to be freely acknowledged on every side. The standpoint from which the Confessions of the sixteenth century were framed is not the same that now asserts itself and rules in theological thought. True, the systems still taught in our theological seminaries have not all changed with this change of standpoint, but so far as they have not they have become fossilized. This does not, indeed, detract from a certain merit they may still possess, but it is the merit that belongs to a relic of the past. No galvanizing process can make them live again in the present order of religious thought. They were living once because they were abreast with the religious thought of the age, but they are dead now because they stand in another and different order of thought and life.

It would be a terrible misfortune if this were not the case; for Christianity, though one and the same in all times, yet in its apprehension is a living movement. This requires, in the very nature of the case, that it must be differently apprehended as Christian history moves onward towards its goal. We care not to stop in order to discuss this point. It would seem to be a waste of time. The leading theological thinkers of the age all admit now the idea of historical development as applied to Christianity, and by consequence to theology.* We hear it in

* "The theology of our age stands in a vital relation to the Christian belief and thought of that age. The task of theology as a science is not simply to formulate and systematize the facts and truths of revelation in their objective, unchanging form. Rather it is concerned with those facts and truths as they lie in the common Christian consciousness, grasped by the common faith. That there may be doctrines, there must first be beliefs. That there may be a system to be

the inaugural addresses of theological teachers, it underlies the growing troubles in regard to Church Confessions, and it is making itself felt in the practical life of the Church, in the contest between faith and unbelief. This last is what makes it specially important. It is not a speculative question merely like many of the controversies of metaphysicians, which are important in their place, but which do not touch so directly the welfare of the race. Philosophy cannot save the world, and the want of it, in itself, will not condemn the world. But the question here is one which touches directly the most sacred interests of man.

As confirmatory of what is here asserted, and as asserting what is not at all new in the thinking of our Reformed Church, we quote the language of Dr. Schaff in his report before the Reformed Alliance, at the meeting at Edinburgh, Scotland, July, 1877, and which was accepted by that body, and has stood uncontradicted ever since.

THE THEOLOGICAL STANDPOINT.—The theology of the Confessions was anti-Romish, and directed against the unscriptural traditions and additions of superstition or misbelief; the modern evangelical theology is anti-rationalistic, and directed against the deductions and negations of unbelief. The former had to deal with an excessive supernaturalism, the latter with the denial of the supernatural and miraculous. The former was chiefly concerned with anthropological and soteriological problems; the latter has to vindicate the authenticity and integrity of the Bible against negative criticism, the existence and personality of God against Atheism and Pantheism, and the true divinity and historicity of Christ against the mythical, legendary, and humanitarian pseudo-Christologies of the nineteenth century.

taught, a system must previously exist in the living thought of the Church. Each period must draw the material of its theology out of its own profound convictions, mold it by its own intellect, and utter it in its own words. As Dorner has said, 'No age can perform this service for another,' etc., etc."

Inaugural Address delivered June 1st, 1881, by LEWIS F. STEARNS, Professor of Systematic Theology in Bangor Theological Seminary.

Hence some doctrines which were most prominent in the Reformation period must give precedence to others which were then not disputed by the contending parties. Modern theology is neither solifidian nor predestinarian nor sacramentarian, but Christological. The pivotal or central doctrine round which all others cluster, is not justification by faith, nor election and reprobation, nor the mode of the eucharistic presence, but the great mystery of God manifest in the flesh, the divine-human personality and atoning work of our Lord. In this respect modern theology goes back to the primitive confession of Peter (Matt. xvi. 16), and the criterion of John concerning the marks of Antichrist (1 John iv. 2, 3). The great question on which the very existence of Christianity depends is again asked, "Who do men say that I the Son of Man am?" And to this question the experience of eighteen centuries returns the answer of the first confessor, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

All evangelical denominations, in their ablest divines, are verging toward a Christological theology, in which alone they can ultimately adjust their differences. For the nearer they approach Christ, the nearer they will come to each other. Christ is the true concord of ages, the divine harmony of human discords.

At the last meeting of the Alliance, held in Philadelphia in the fall of 1880, this was the first point in the opening sermon of Dr. Paxton, of New York, and emphasized in different ways during the whole of the sessions. It comes to us now from the leading theologians of New England, and even where it is not consciously brought forward there is a sense of it in the felt necessity for an advance in theological thought to meet the religious wants of the present age.*

* We refer here also to a report in the *Christian Intelligencer*, of Dec. 14, 1881, of Dr. Mabon's inaugural address at New Brunswick on "The Christ in Theology." The report by the editor says, "Dr. Mabon, in this address, places himself in line with the foremost theological thought of the day, and entrenches himself in the very citadel of Christian defence and aggressive power. Chris-

But in order to be a living power it must not remain a mere assertion or proposition, but it must show practical results in modifying and moulding our theological systems, and, what is more, it must enter into the practical life of the Church. It will amount to very little to place it at the head of our theologies, and then go on organizing them as before. What we call the standpoint, or central principle, must show itself in every doctrine, intoning it with new life, and it must in like manner mould all our religious life. At the time of the Reformation the doctrine of justification by faith resounded in all their theologies and in all their life and worship. It is easy to see that it intones all other doctrines. In Lutheran theologies especially it became the beginning, middle and end of the system. This illustrates what is meant by a central principle.*

tianity is not in a creed, nor even in an inspired book, except as they reveal and lead to the Living Christ. He announced his motto to be, not that of old Chillingworth, admirable as it was in its day, "The Bible, and the Bible alone, the Religion of Protestants," . . . but "The Christ and the Bible the Theology for the People." . . . It will be a theology that shall make our Lord and our Life real and personal and present, the center and source of all truth." There are some expressions in this report which led us to feel that the address did not at all points come up fully to the motto, but that may have been owing to the brevity of the report. The impression made on our mind was, however, that New Brunswick aims to intone the Christological principle as central in its theology.

* "This Christocentric tendency is not confined to apologetics. It is characteristic of the religious thought of the time generally, and will undoubtedly influence the coming theology, especially in its structure as a system. The preaching, the religious literature, the practical religion of the day, find the productive source of Christianity, its vital center, in the personality of Jesus Christ, the God-man, the Mediator between God and man. . . . But while we hold thus firmly to Christ's divinity, our age has rejoiced to learn with new power the meaning of His humanity. The devotion with which the gospel history has been studied, the great number and popularity of the lives of Christ which have appeared during the last three or four decades, show the direction of current thought. It is in the man Christ Jesus that this generation has been taught to discover the God who is manifest in the flesh. . . . The system of Christian doctrine must find its center in Christ. The old Reformed theology, the theology of Calvin and of the Westminster and Savoy Confessions, the theology of our American Calvinistic churches, centered in the decrees of God. . . . But the new

Now, if the person of Christ is of this central character, it must in like manner assert itself in theology and Christian life. And just this is what is needed, if the principle is not merely a name, a shibboleth. Is this what is really needed at the present time to meet the want so sorely felt? And, if so, how is the principle to assert itself in correcting what is wrong?

In a paper like this we can refer only to a few points to illustrate what we mean.

I. In relation to God. All theology starts with the doctrine of God, and all true religious life turns on a right knowledge of God, according to our Lord's words, "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."

It may, indeed, be supposed that the doctrine of the Trinity has been so fully settled and fixed that it can need no further restatement or rectification for the faith of the Church. There is a disposition, when difficulties in regard to it are raised, to take refuge behind the mystery it involves for human thought, and rest satisfied in the mere-assertion that it cannot be understood at any rate. Therefore, it is said, we need not concern ourselves further with the formula by which it is stated. But this is obscurantism, and it overlooks the fact that the doctrine of the Trinity is of eminently practical importance for faith. In his late work on "Modern Doubt and Christian Belief," Dr. Christlieb urges, and rightly we think, that the doctrine of the Trinity requires a new and better apprehension in the direction of the unity of the Godhead. The old *Monarchians* were not fighting for a shadow when they urged the emphasis of the oneness of the Godhead over against what they regarded as a tendency in the direction of tri-theism. Dr. Christlieb thinks there is a necessity for regarding God the Father as *Fons totius Deitatis*, in order to properly set before the mind the one uni-

theology finds another center. It is fitting that Christ, who is the center of the Christian religion, as He is the vital center of His church, should be the center of the theological system. About Him all the truths and doctrines must group themselves."—*Inaugural Address of Lewis F. Stearns, etc.*

ifying principle of the Godhead. But we think there is a still greater necessity to see in Christ the *one revelation* of the Godhead.

We do not propose here to enter upon a consideration of the use of the inadequate word *person* as expressing the distinctions in the Godhead. For the general intelligence that word does convey the impression that the divine hypostases are *out* of each other, instead of *in* each other as theology teaches, and this common notion does lead to a tri-theistic conception of the Deity. Perhaps this difficulty cannot be entirely removed. But there is a way, we think, by which the danger of a tri-theistic conception of God may be avoided, and that is, not as Dr. Christlieb suggests, by regarding the Father as the *Fons totius Deitatis* (that may be right in its place), but by regarding our Lord Jesus Christ as not merely the Son of God, the second person of the Trinity, but as *the revelation of the Godhead*, the revelation, not merely in the way of teaching the world of the Father and the Spirit, but as being in His divine-human person the only revelation of the Godhead.

Let us state the practical difficulty here brought to view. It is said the one-ness of the Godhead consists in the one divine essence, while the trinity consists in the three persons.* But this one essence remains for the ordinary apprehension an abstraction. Men do not exactly worship *it*, they do not pray to it, but they pray to the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit. And in some prayers it is not difficult to see the confusion that is thus introduced, especially in passing, for instance, from an

* "Our Church formularies are undoubtedly right in laying stress on the unity of substance in these divine Persons; but it may be questioned whether they are also right in seeming to speak of the divine substance as if it were, in the first instance, something indefinite and universal, which was then resolved into three distinct hypostases. When we speak of 'three persons in one divine substance,' we use an expression which apparently implies that *the substance is regarded as something abstract and impersonal*, which assumes a threefold personality in the concrete forms of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. Many earnest inquirers are sensible of a certain incongruity between this mode of speaking and the teaching of Scripture."—DR. CHRISTLIEB—*Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*.

address to Christ to God, as the unity of the three persons. What or whom do they place before themselves when they use the term God? Is it not often a vague conception merely, or a union of the three which still confuses the mind? We have confused those who are acquainted with theological terminology by asking the question, is God a person? Perhaps it would be easier to answer the question, is God a personal being?

Could not this difficulty be avoided by directing our faith to Christ as the absolute revelation of the Godhead, in such sense that we must find the Father revealed *in Him*, and not merely by Him? Then, when we think of God, we think only of *God in Christ*. We think the teaching of our Lord in the New Testament points most emphatically and directly to this conclusion. When He spake to the disciples of the deep *arcana* of the Godhead, and discoursed to them of *the Father*, Philip said, "Show us the Father." Our Lord replied, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." The distinction between the Father and the Son is maintained, but the truth is emphasized that the Father is in Christ.

There was reason why our Lord revealed this truth to the disciples, especially at the close of His earthly life, for they could receive it only as their faith became fixed subsequently upon His glorification. They had come to believe and know that the divine was in Him, but how could the fullness of the Godhead dwell in Him as He appeared to them in His limited, finite form in His state of humiliation? God must be somewhere else also than in Him, for God is infinite. But now when He was glorified in His return to the Father, His humanity became the adequate expression of His divinity, and He who ascended up far above all heavens, could fill all things with His presence and glory.

We now advance a step, and ask, must we not conceive of the glorified humanity of our ascended Lord as the form and revelation of the whole Godhead? "In Him the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily." If His humanity is the form of reve-

lation of His divinity, of the Logos, and the Logos is the express image of the Father, then does it not follow that His humanity is the form of the Godhead, of the holy Trinity?

This is neither Monopitism nor Eutychianism. It does not do away with the distinction between the divinity and humanity of our Lord. That distinction remains. But their relation is conceived of as like that between body and soul, according to the Athanasian creed. The Man Christ Jesus is the form in which we worship God. We need not be able to solve the difficulty that the humanity of our Lord is finite, and that it cannot therefore be commensurate with His divinity. The question is not one of mathematical calculation and measurement. We are not to study the subject of the Trinity in the light of Arithmetic or Geometry. There is quite too much of that sort of calculation in the Athanasian creed. His humanity takes character from His divinity. If the soul resident in the body is human, the body also is human. May we not say, then, that if the divinity resides in humanity, as the soul in the body, that humanity must be in some sense divine. It becomes the potential organ for the divinity. Whether we can explain the mystery fully or not, we may see that the humanity of our Lord has become for us and for the whole created universe the revelation and utterance of the fullness of the Godhead. That humanity in its glorification has been lifted up into the Godhead, has become filled with Deity, and now transcends all our comprehension. Who would now think of setting any limits to our Lord's humanity? Can we conceive of the limits of His humanity in knowledge, in power, in love? "All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth," He declares, and certainly He reigns as King of kings and Lord of lords through His humanity.

We thus reach the conclusion that we must set before our faith the glorified humanity of Christ as the form of the Godhead, and that we must worship God in the divine-human person of our Lord. This is nothing new, it will be said, for the Church has always taught it. But we fear it has not really

been made to confront our faith in a practical way. The idea has been that our Lord Jesus Christ reveals God to us in the way of teaching, but it has not been felt and acknowledged that He reveals God to us in His person. To refer again to the subject of worship, it seems to us that in prayer, for instance, the person of our Lord in His glorified humanity is not always placed before the worshipper in his devotions as the only form according to which we are to conceive of God. There is a tendency to think of the three persons of the Godhead as confronting us in some sense in three forms. In the Middle Ages it was maintained by some that God the Father has a form like that of God the Son, otherwise how could it be said that the Son is the likeness of the Father? We do not suppose this is held in the same way now; but that there is a disposition to conceive of God in a three-fold revelation in some way, for the thought if not for the sense, is very evident.

We do not mean to ignore or exclude the revelation of God in nature and in conscience. There is a sense in which God is known to all men. St. Paul in his epistle to the *Romans* clearly teaches this. In his address to the Athenians he says, "Whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you." But in the first place, it must not be forgotten that the revelation in nature and conscience is through the Logos. "All things were made through it (or Him), and without Him was not any thing made that was made. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." That whole præme of St. John down to the 14th verse refers to the revelation of God through the pre-existent Logos. In the second place, all the revelations of God come to their completion or fullness in the Incarnate Word. Hence, now that Christ is come in the flesh and glorified in the Spirit, He is the only absolute revelation of God. To think of God out of Christ now is to deny the only true God. When science and philosophy speak of God as the great first Cause, or assert that man can believe in God without believing in Christ, they are deluded and blind. Such a God is only an intellectual abstraction.

The great central truth of the Christian religion, therefore, is that our Lord Jesus Christ is God, the only true God. Men may talk of contending for theism, belief in one personal God, as something broader and deeper than Christianity, but that is nothing better than Judaism or Mohammedanism. The Jews rejected Christ, and in doing so they lost all right knowledge of God. It must come at last to believe in Jesus Christ or Atheism. He is exalted to the right hand of the majesty in the heavens, and is Lord of heaven and earth.

And it is through this gateway of faith in Christ as God that we come to know the Bible, Christ and His Word. Unbelievers attack the Bible as the Word of God, but their assault must carry with it at the same time a denial of Christ; for He endorsed and authenticated the Bible. He sets His seal to the O. T. revelation. He refers to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,—to David and Solomon, and Jonah. Now if the O. T. is not the perfect and pure Word of God, including its history of those characters, and its teaching in reference to them, then He was mistaken. Let us think of this for a moment. Our Lord was pure and holy. Even unbelievers can find no defect in His pure and perfect life. Could He endorse and honor as the Word of God any thing that was impure or unholy? Yet poor, imperfect men like Ingersoll claim that the Bible is not pure from their estimate and judgment. Do they claim to be better judges than our Lord Jesus Christ? The very thought is simply blasphemous!

The attack of rationalism as conducted by such men as Strauss and Bauer wavered continually between opposing Christ and the Bible. It was found at last that, in order to overthrow the divine authority of the Bible, it was necessary to deny the claims of Christ. And so it is now. Christ endorsed the O. T. as the Word of God. Modern critics find fault with it. One of two things must be true: either Christ was in error, or the Bible, the whole Bible, must be the pure Word of God.

It may be said, this is reasoning in a circle. We obtain our

knowledge of Christ from the Bible, and then Christ authenticates the Bible as the Word of God. But it is not a vicious circle. The record that makes Christ known to us as a historical personage is acknowledged to be genuine and authentic as mere history. The representation thus given challenges our faith in His purity and truth. Even skeptics believe this of Him. But if He is this, He is more; for no one could claim what He does and not be divine, or else untruthful. Here then we find the source and foundation of revelation, and here we must find the impregnable defence of the Bible as the Word of God. This thought seems to be somewhat of a departure from our thesis, that our Lord is the absolute and only revelation of the Godhead for our faith, but it is closely allied to it. He is Lord over all, and therefore He illumines the Word of God in the Scriptures. The defence of the Bible and Christianity all centres here. Just in the degree in which faith falters and grows weak in Christ as God, in that degree will it become powerless in relation to Christianity and the Bible. With Nathanael we must say, "Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel;" with Thomas, "My Lord and my God;" and with Peter, "We believe and are sure that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

We pass on from these hints in regard to the Trinity to refer to another doctrine, viz. :

II. *The Atonement.* If the revelation of God in Christ is of supreme importance in reference to the doctrine of the Trinity—how we are to know and worship the one only true and living God, it is of central significance also in reference to redemption, God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. The influence of the tri-theistic tendency is here equally manifest. It would be presumptuous to undertake in the space before us a reconsideration of the dogma of the atonement. We aim not at that. All we desire is to show that if the Christological principal is central, it must come to rule also here, not in the way of overthrowing formulas and theories settled in the Church, but to place them in right relation to itself, and to regenerate them with its own life.

Although not more dangerously, yet more patently, the tritheistic tendency has wrought in reference to this dogma than in reference to that of the Holy Trinity. All the theories in reference to this dogma have incurred the danger of representing the work of the atonement as holding in some way outside the person of the Lord, and as going along with this, representing the Father and the Son, not as one, but only as two separate and distinct parties in the transaction.

The primitive theory of an offering made to Satan contained in it a great truth, viz., that the atonement involved a real contest with the world of evil, and the deliverance of man from its thralldom. Already, however, the conception of a commercial transaction entered into the theory, as though in some way man's redemption were something to be secured as holding outside of the person of Christ. Man had voluntarily sold himself in bondage to the evil one. Satan held him in the dark prison-house of sin. A substitute must be found, and an offering made to Satan, as the purchase of man's deliverance. Christ offered Himself as the sacrifice, and by His sufferings and death in man's stead, purchased man's deliverance. One cannot fail to see here the deep underlying truth, that the work of our Lord in securing man involved on His part a real contest with the kingdom of darkness. The power of Satan had to be broken, his kingdom overthrown, before the Lord could proclaim liberty to the captives and lead many sons in triumph to glory. But the deliverance thus becomes external to the person and work of Christ. He becomes a means or instrument for their deliverance rather than the source of it. Consequently, in the development of the Roman system, this deliverance became an external gift which could be made over to men by the power of the Church, through the sacraments *ex opere operato*. The view of Irenæus penetrated far more deeply, and revealed more fully the internal relation of the person of Christ to man's redemption.

Then came the *satisfaction theory* of Anselm, according to which the antithesis was found to exist, not between God and

Satan, which required the sacrifice, but between the justice and the mercy of God. Satisfaction had to be made to God for the debt incurred by man's transgression of His holy law. As man could not make this satisfaction, Christ offered Himself as a substitute. He suffered the penalty in man's stead, and on this condition God could justly release man from it. This theory obtained acceptance down to the Reformation, because incorporated in the Reformation Confessions, and has thus come down to us. At the time of the Reformation the ethical factor was added to it, making the appropriation of the purchased redemption to depend on faith, and not something to be made over to men externally merely by the sacraments of the Church. But in the hands of solidianism it became again something external, and faith was made to work the transfer in the same magical way as in Romanism.

We accept what of truth there is in this satisfaction theory as far as it is taught in the Word of God, but it needs also to be brought in right relation to a sound Christology, otherwise it tends to the most dangerous error. The false way in which it has been held has done immense evil in weakening the whole idea of redemption, and in making this idea abhorrent to man's sense of right and justice, as well as of the mercy of God. We have no desire to caricature it, for we would rather hide than lay bare its weakness, were not the sacred interests of truth involved.

Our principal criticism in reference to it is, that it sacrifices the unity of God and introduces a dualism which represents God as at war with Himself. Instead of being *in Christ*, reconciling the world unto Himself, it represents Him as out of Christ and over Christ, from whom He exacts the penalty for man's sin. God the Father is represented as one party in the Godhead, and God the Son another. Offended justice calls for the penalty of a broken law. Man, the transgressor, is doomed to eternal death. He cannot be pardoned until the penalty is paid. The Son then comes forward and offers Himself as the innocent victim. He takes the offender's place, and now

the wrath of an offended God descends upon His head until the last drop of blood is shed, God is satisfied and offers pardon to a guilty world. On so sacred a subject we would speak reverently, but the manner in which this "blood theory" is often presented is sufficient to offend even man's sense of justice, while it is set forth as the only means of satisfying divine justice. In the first place the unity of the Godhead is violated by thus bringing one person in it into antagonism with another, the Father with the Son. In the second place it violates the deepest sense of justice to allow of a substitution of the innocent for the guilty in the way the subject is often represented. In the third place the redemption purchased is here also regarded as holding outside of the person of our Lord, and then as something to be made over in a like external way. As though redemption could be found anywhere else than *in Christ*, and as though it could be anything for man except as it becomes a work also *in him*.

Dr. Hodge of Princeton, claims that this satisfaction theory of the atonement is central for the dogma, and urges it so tenaciously as to create the impression that he regards it as the central principle of all theology. Other theories have been presented, the Moral theory, the Governmental theory, etc.

Now what we claim is, that if the person of Christ is central, as is acknowledged, then this principle must rule here also in this great doctrine of the Atonement. The atonement (at-one-ment) must be sought and found *in Christ*, not in some boon that He purchased for man as holding out of Himself.

Let us endeavor as briefly as possible to sketch this idea. God created man for union and happiness with Him in a supernatural and heavenly state of being. When man lost this by his fall under the power of sin, it became necessary for God to descend into the depths of fallen humanity, in order to work out for him, not only deliverance from the thralldom of sin, but also to introduce the principle of a new, undying, life, in the power of which man could be lifted up into communion and fellowship with Him. Hence the necessity for the mystery of

the incarnation. In this mystery God and man became one—He took our humanity into union with His divinity. He thus, through infinite love, revealed Himself to man and in man, as the Almighty conqueror of death and hell, within the realm of our fallen humanity. In thus uniting our fallen humanity with His divine nature He assumed all the burdens resting upon it. In the sphere of our human life He saved Himself from all the contamination of sin by resisting the temptations of the evil one; as the new head of our fallen race He really assumed all its reproach and shame, He overcame the world of darkness, vanquished the power of death and hell, and having thus suffered the penalty of sin, not as something externally imputed to Him, but, as the necessary consequence of assuming our humanity, He arose from the dead in the power of His own life, by the eternal Spirit, and filled His human life with the fullness of the divine in His glorification. Thus all the obstacles that separated man from God were removed, and humanity was brought into harmony with God—the atonement held primarily in His own person. He sanctified Himself—He perfected Himself—in order that He might thus be the source of sanctification to those who should partake of His redemption and salvation.

But in all this work of the New Creation, rising in greatness and glory far above the work of the first creation, *God was in Christ*, as He was when He spake the first creation into being. "All things were made by Him." Christ came forth from the bosom of the Father, He did the Father's will, and carrying the glorious work He had done with Him He again returned to the Father. The redemption now is in His person. He is the source of it. He imparts it to man as a new and heavenly life that flows from His glorified humanity, and thus those who believe are taken up into the same sphere of life, and thus are reconciled to God and share His love.

The conquering of Satan—the world of darkness, is included in this work, the suffering of the penalty is in it, the vindication of the divine government is in it, the moral power of the

divine love as exhibited in His death upon the cross is in it, but these all inhere in His person, and not in any supposed good which He purchased as outside of Himself.

By such a representation of the atonement we preserve what is true in the partial theories referred to, while we eliminate what is weak and one-sided. We place the person of our Lord in the centre of this great work of love and mercy for man, and regard Him as the source of redemption and not merely an instrument. We reverently place before our faith His Godhead, and His relation to the Father from whom He came forth and to whom in His glorification He returned. "I came forth from the Father and am come into the world; again I leave the world and go unto the Father." He does not stand in antagonism to the Father, as though God was regarding Him as a substitute placed externally in the place of man who had sinned; but the Father was in Him in the work of rescuing and redeeming man from the power of sin and death.

He was the revealer and the bearer of the Father's love to man. How fatal to all right views of God is it to think, for a moment, that our Lord was in any sense arrayed against God, as though God could not and would not love man until He was appeased by the death of Christ, and that, in the face of those words, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish but have eternal life." But did not Christ endure the wrath of God against sinful man? He suffered, we reply, all the consequences of man's sin, by taking man's fallen nature, but this in no way disturbed that inward union and harmony between the Father and the Son. Even the awful cry wrenched from Him in His supreme agony, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!" dare not be pressed or interpreted as involving an antagonism between the Father and the Son. It was the expression, indeed, of His sense of desolation in antagonizing the world of darkness and vindicating the justice of God's holy law, but in the full consciousness that He was in full harmony with the divine will. There are mysteries here which

our poor minds cannot fathom, but let us beware construing them in such a way as to destroy for our faith the unity or oneness of our Jehovah, God. The antithesis was, not between Him and the Father, but between His state of humiliation and state of exaltation. We say not, with Sabellianism, that the Father became incarnate and died on the Cross in the character of Son, for man, but we say God humbled Himself to be our Saviour through the unspeakable sufferings of Calvary. Having triumphed gloriously over all His enemies, having conquered death and hell, He led captivity captive and ascended up far above all heavens whence He gave gifts unto men. We say again, redemption was wrought out in His person, and redemption flows forth from His person as its source, and is not in any sense a boon beyond Him which He purchased by means of His death upon the cross. God is love, and our Lord came into the world to reveal that love, and His sufferings were caused by removing the obstacles that stood in the way of the divine love reaching man.

III. In the third place the *impartation* of redemption in man's salvation must be interpreted from the standpoint of the person of Christ. Salvation is the making over to man the redemption wrought out by Christ through man's free acceptance of that redemption by faith. God is in Christ in imparting salvation to man.

Here we meet again a scheme by which Christ the Lord is separated from the giving of life to man. The doctrine of an external imputation of the redemption purchased by Christ, is on a par with the idea of an external imputation of man's sin and misery to Christ. Salvation is conceived of as a transfer of the divine favor in the pardon of sin and in justification, as a transaction between God and the sinner in which the person of Christ is left out, except as His atoning work purchased the gift. Of course the name of Christ is constantly used, if it be only in the phrase, "for Christ's sake." But so far as the theory defines itself at all it fails to make the person of Christ the constant source of salvation to men.

Yet no other truth is more emphasized than this, that the new life of the believer is the life of the Lord in him. It is so in its very inception. "What is thy greatest comfort in life and death?" asks the Catechism, and the answer is, "that I am not my own, but belong to my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ, etc." This implies a transfer of self-direction to the direction and control of Christ, and this not in any merely external way, but by an internal and vital union with Him. Our Lord Himself expresses this vital union in the most emphatic way, in the parabolic allegory of the vine and the branches, in the discourse in the vi. chap. of St. John on the bread that came down from heaven, and in many other places in the New Testament. Personal salvation is the gift of His ascension. When He ascended up on high He gave gifts unto men. The fountain of all gifts is His glorified humanity, from which came forth the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, through whom the Church is united in living union with its glorified Lord.

Salvation consists essentially in the life of God in the soul. "As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they all may be one in us." "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." When Christ was glorified He passed into that one-ness with the Father in which He lived eternally. Now, therefore, they are not to be thought of as out of each other, but we are to approach the Father *in* the Son, and the life of the Lord in the believer is the love of God as a new living power in him by which he becomes principled in love to God and love to his fellow-men. Thus the law of God in the spirit of love becomes written on his mind and heart, Justification by faith, however it may be conceived of as a forensic act, must have its standing in this union with the Lord, for it is only *in* Him that man can begin to be saved.

IV. *The Divine Decrees.* We have given these heads of Christian doctrine without any particular regard to their connection, to illustrate and apply our general subject.

In the Reformed Confessions of the XVIth century the divine election or decree is spoken of as being an election *in*

Christ. This phraseology is of great importance as bearing witness to the force of the Christological idea, even though it was not logically and consistently carried out in their theological thinking. The divine decree is before the foundation of the world, it is a decree in eternity, and carried out in time. This became a central principle for the Calvinistic theory of the divine Sovereignty. The decree of God which determined the salvation of the elect was conceived of as holding in the divine will; the scheme of redemption was adopted in order to carry out this decree. Christ thus became the means or instrument of salvation. The divine will is here regarded as before Christ, and in this will the source of salvation is found.

Without enlarging further in the statement of this theory, it is at once plain that it does not start with a right conception of Christ. He is eternally the divine Logos, and was in the beginning, so that we cannot think of God or His will as being *before* the Logos in any sense. Metaphysical speculation here only leads into confusion and darkness. The divine will is not abstract. It is *in* Christ, and therefore we must think of it in revelation, the only way we have to do with it. Speculation here as to "the councils of God in eternity" as the phrase is, is of all things most idle and vain. In Proverbs we read of *Wisdom* as living in this familiarity with God before the mountains were brought forth or ever the world was, but surely no finite intellect can presume to fathom the mind of God. Human logic may assume to assert that God from all eternity decreed the fall of man, and also determined to provide redemption through the atonement, but this has not been revealed to man as the will of God, and it would seem to be more appropriate to allow what is not revealed as beyond the reach of human understanding. Christ is the revelation of the divine will. For man this revelation is historical, and in that form he has to do with it. Hence we must come to Christ to inquire what the will of God is, and we cannot seek it beyond Him or apart from Him.

According to this view our Lord is not made the instrument

or means of carrying out a scheme formed in the divine mind, but He is the expression of that will as holding in Him, and the source of salvation. To seek for the divine will in any other form except in revelation, is to attempt to carry our reasoning in regard to God into the sphere of eternity, and when we do that we carry with us the category of time, and undertake to explain eternity by conceptions of time. In God's absolute being there is no before nor after in His relations to Himself, but all is an eternal now. If we can know God only in Christ, then the mystery of His will can be known only in the same revelation. We do not say that this removes the mystery, or that it brings it within the compass of finite reason, but it places the mystery in the person of our Lord, who is Himself the solution of the revelation between the divine sovereignty and man's free agency—in other words, He unites in Himself the finite and the infinite. Thus the mystery is set before us, not as an abstract, logical, question, but as a living reality. Thus we can embrace it by faith, and study it in the light of His person and work.

But we cannot now carry our subject farther. We feel persuaded that the teaching of the Bible sets forth for our faith the Lord in a different relation to the Father from that in which much of the current theology regards Him. The representation of heavenly worship as given in the Apocalypse shows that in heaven He is the only form of the revelation of the Godhead. And the very early Church directed their worship to Him as *the Lord*, the revelation of God. God, therefore, should be worshipped *in Christ*, who is the fullness of the Godhead, and in Him the unity of the Godhead is revealed for our faith. When He comes to be owned, and acknowledged, and worshipped, as Jehovah God, and His presence and life are regarded as the life of all His people, not only on earth, but in all worlds, even in the heaven of heavens, we shall come to see and know what it means to make the Lord Christ central in all our theology, in all our worship, and in all our Christian life. Then we shall also know God the Father as revealed in Him,

as nearer to us than in any other possible thought of His being, and the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father and the Son. When the oneness of the Godhead becomes thus a reality for our worship in Christ our Lord, the objections of Unitarianism will either have to give way, or it will be driven to deny the Lord of life and glory. Jehovah said to Moses, "I AM THAT I AM." "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you."

In St. John viii. 24, our Lord says, "For if ye believe not that I AM ye shall die in your sins." "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."

ART. VIII.—CHRIST'S SATISFACTION, AND ITS RELATION TO
THE SINNER'S JUSTIFICATION.

BY REV. F. W. KREMER, D.D.

THE sin of Adam effected a two-fold separation between God and the race; one legal, the other moral. Man created after God's image was a moral and intelligent being, a proper subject of law. In this character he was accountable to his Maker, to whom he owed supreme love and obedience. This relation God clearly indicated to Adam when He announced to him His law in reference to the forbidden fruit, and made known to him in clear terms the penalty of disobedience. Man was thus furnished with the strongest motives to obedience, the avoidance of death on the one hand, on the other, the assurance of life and uninterrupted fellowship with his Maker. But though created free, and with the ability to obey God, he failed properly to appreciate and guard his freedom, and yielding to the solici-

tations of the wily enemy he fell, and in his fall involved the race in depravity and ruin. Hence "all are by nature the children of wrath," and "there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Added to inherited depravity, and as its natural result, man violates both the natural and written law of God, and thus departs more and more from the great Source of light and life. In this condition there exists between God and man an impenetrable barrier, not only through the violation of law, but also by the alienation of the heart from God. But though fallen, the claims of God remain in their original force—the law has not been relaxed in the least degree to accommodate itself to man's changed condition, since man fell in the wrong exercise of his freedom, and in direct opposition to the mandate of his Maker. In this condition, man, if left to his own resources, is utterly without hope. He cannot satisfy the demands of God's law, nor change his own heart. If saved, it must be through a scheme that the infinite mind of God alone could devise. And such a scheme God in mercy announced to the original pair soon after the apostacy, when he promised that the "seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head." In this terse saying was wrapped up the world's redemption. It involved the incarnation of the eternal Logos—the union of God with man. God's plan to save the race rendered it necessary that the same nature that sinned should suffer for sin. But this nature must be sinless, and hence the Son of God was "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." The divine must be joined to the human in personal union, so as to sustain it in the great work of redemption, and to invest all Christ did and suffered with a divine excellency and merit. In this way alone could the demands of the law be met both as to its precept and its penalty. Christ came to fulfil all righteousness, to obey the law at every point, and to endure in full its terrible sanctions. After what has been said, we are now prepared to consider more particularly the passive obedience of the Son of God in which is found in its highest degree the very essence of redemption.

The Holy Scriptures, whilst making just account of the *prophetic* office of the Redeemer, emphasize His *priestly* character. They lay special stress on the Saviour's sufferings and death. The first promise in Gen. 3: 15, looks specially towards Christ's death in which He would "bruise the serpent's head." The sin and trespass offerings made by sinners, and to make expiation for sin under the Old Testament dispensation, were at the same time types of the one great sacrifice—Jesus Christ. The Apostle Paul, referring to the paschal lamb, in 1 Cor. 5: 7, says, "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us."

But we have in the Old Testament not only bloody offerings, which pre-figure the Redeemer and His death, as a sacrifice for sin; we have besides express declarations to the same effect. We may refer to the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, where Christ's death is not only clearly predicted, but spoken of as vicarious, as a propitiation for the sins of His people. "He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows." "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities." "With his stripes we are healed." "For the transgression of my people was he stricken." "The chastisement of our peace was upon him." That the inspired prophet intended to convey in this language the idea of vicarious suffering, the atoning death of the Son of God, must be clear, especially in the light of many passages in the New Testament, some of which we now produce.

And we first direct attention to the name JESUS, given Him by the angel before His birth, with the words, "For he shall save his people from their sins." Matt. 1: 21. John the Baptist, on seeing Jesus approaching him said, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." It must be clear that the Baptist saw in Christ the great anti-type of the Jewish lamb offered as a sacrifice for sin. The Saviour Himself says in John 12: 24, in evident reference to His death, "Verily, Verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the

wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." John 3: 14, 15. "Father, save me from this hour; but for this cause came I unto this hour." John 12: 27. "For this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matt. 26: 28. "For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Mark 10: 45. I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." John 10: 11. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." John 12: 32. "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. 3: 24. "For when we were yet without strength in due time Christ died for the ungodly." Rom. 5: 6. "We preach Christ crucified unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." 1 Cor. 1: 23, 24. "And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ." 2 Cor. 5: 18. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Gal. 3: 13. "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." Gal. 6: 14. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Eph. 1: 7. "And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." Eph. 2: 16. Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." 1 Cor. 15: 3.

"Without the shedding of blood is no remission." Heb. 9: 22. "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. 9: 28. "For by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Heb. 10: 14.

"Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. 9: 12. "Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was

set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." Heb. 12 : 2. "And He is the propitiation for our sins : and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 Jno. 2 : 2. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." 1 Jno. 4 : 10. "Unto Him that loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father; to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." Rev. 1 : 5, 6.

These quotations, though ample, are but a few selected from many others of the same import. The question comes up here, What does the Holy Ghost design to teach in these passages? To this question many different answers have been given. We may notice first what may be termed the *Satan* theory.

In the early history of the Church, during its first centuries, the doctrines of Christianity, though not unknown, and exerting their saving power upon the hearts of men, had not been fully formulated and scientifically apprehended. In many cases truth was mixed with error. One of the errors held and taught even by such men as Origen and Theodoret, was that Christ offered Himself a ransom to Satan, who by his subtlety and malice had succeeded in accomplishing the fall of the race. Satan's claim to his conquered subjects was in a sense conceded. Hence it was held that Christ by His death rendered a satisfaction to Satan. This false and fanciful theory was however antagonized by such eminent men as Athanasius (A. D. 370), Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, and Eusebius of Cæsarea. Gradually the mists that had enveloped the grand scheme of redemption were dissipated by the ever brightening light of God's truth. It became clear to the Church that Satan has no just claim to his authority over the fallen race, and that he is a deceiver and usurper. But so great and vital a doctrine as that of the atonement would not be allowed to go unassailed. Every effort possible must be made to obscure or undermine it, and so thwart and destroy its very design. Accordingly the

arch-enemy of God and man, with insidious cunning proceeded to involve the vicarious idea of the atonement in contempt by holding it up as both absurd and unjust. And with a view to more certain success, the *Moral Theory* was invented.

This theory professes a high regard for Jesus Christ. He is spoken of as the most eminent and exalted of all the prophets, and as being in a peculiar sense the Son of God. It may be allowed that He was without sin; that in His life He was a perfect example of holiness and goodness; that He preached the truth as no one ever did before, and wrought more miracles than any of the prophets or apostles. Those who hold this theory admit also that in a peculiar sense He died for the people. But He died only as a martyr, and not as the eternal Son of God, and in the sinner's stead. In a word, His sufferings and death were not propitiatory or vicarious. All He suffered was to make a moral impression on God's intelligent universe, and especially on our fallen race. It was designed to impress mankind especially with the evil of sin and God's mercy and loving-kindness. And all this, it is held, could be accomplished by one who was not divine, but man only, though pure and without sin. Says Dr. Channing: "We maintain that this doctrine of God becoming a victim and sacrifice for His own rebellious subjects is as irrational as it is unscriptural." Again he says: "To build the hope of pardon on the independent and infinite sufficiency of Jesus Christ, is to build on an unscriptural and false foundation."* Says another of the same school: "We have no part whatever in that idea so strongly insisted on by some of our orthodox friends, of Christ having died as man's substitute; of His death on the cross having, as it were, bought mankind off from hell; of His 'blood' being something to shelter behind from the wrath of God. All that seems to us a shocking perversion of the beautiful work which Christ lived and died to do. And no such work was needed, God never needed any reconciling."† This theory, whilst it denies the vicarious character and design of Christ's death, makes light, at

* Channing's Works, pp. 403-4.

† "Unitarian Affirmations," p. 35.

the same time, of sin and of God's justice. It suggests also the question, Why was Christ subjected to a death so terrible and ignominious, if, in the economy of redemption, it was not really necessary? Where was the justice, where the mercy in a tragedy so awful, when no end corresponding to its character was proposed to be reached?

Another unscriptural theory of the atonement is known as the *Commercial Theory*. Debts are transferable, but crimes are not. If a man pays his debts, or if they be paid by another, his creditor is satisfied and the claims of justice are fully met. The element of forgiveness or grace in such a case cannot hold. It is different as to crimes which affect moral character. Should any one offer to make atonement for the crimes of another, and should the offer be accepted, and satisfaction be rendered, this satisfaction would not change the character of the culprit; he would be as really guilty as before satisfaction was rendered, and just as much in need of Divine mercy and forgiveness. The mere fact, therefore, that the Son of God has offered Himself as a substitute in the place of the sinner, and satisfied the claims of Divine justice, does not in itself free the sinner from guilt; his character remains as it was, and his actual pardon may be made properly to turn upon conditions which God, in His wisdom and mercy, may appoint. The *commercial* theory of the atonement is neither philosophical nor scriptural.

Then we have also to deal with the *Governmental Theory*. According to this theory, it is maintained that the sufferings and death of the Redeemer were not really an offering to God, but simply a substitute for the penalty of His violated law; thus giving the intelligent universe an impressive conception of sin itself, and preventing, at the same time, the injurious effects which would otherwise ensue, through the pardon of sin on the part of God. But clearly this end cannot be reached in this way. No such impression as is claimed could be made on the theory that Christ's death was not intended to satisfy God Himself by satisfying the demands of His law. God's purpose to punish sin can be realized only on the theory that Christ's

death was expiatory; that He redeemed man to God by His own blood. "Ye are bought with a price."

We now turn with a feeling of relief to the only true theory of the atonement, and as ever held by the Church of God. This theory we find in the Sacred Scriptures, and contained in such passages as quoted in a former part of this paper. As before intimated, the theory of the atonement, as held by the different branches of the orthodox Church, was not for many centuries clearly and scientifically set forth. The chief credit for its scientific formulation must be given to Anselm, born A. D. 1030.* This able and astute theologian develops the grand doctrine of the atonement with a symmetry and perfection far in advance of past theological science. It must not be inferred, however, that the fundamental principles of the atonement had not been understood before. We may name, among others, Athanasius, Gregorius of Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria. These fathers, in their writings, though not always clear, refer continually to the death of Christ as vicarious. It is, indeed, hard to see how it could have been otherwise. The sacred writings, which they accepted as inspired, are replete with the doctrines of grace, salvation through the one offering of Jesus Christ. This grand fact was symbolized by the bloody sacrifices of the Jewish economy, and thus the people were prepared to understand and to accept Jesus Christ, the "Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." They knew that under the Old Testament dispensation there was no forgiveness "without the shedding of blood," and that in the New Testament Church it is plainly asserted that "Christ died for our sins;" that "in him we have redemption through his blood," and that "He," His own self, "bare our sins in his own body on the tree," passages, with many others, which clearly teach that the Son of God gave His life a ransom for His people, and that they have life through His death. In the light of passages like those quoted, there is no room for any of

* Neander, *Dogmengeschichte*, II., 282.

the different other theories which have been noticed; they must be considered as unsatisfactory as they are unscriptural.

We note with pleasure, as a most interesting fact, that the Catholic Church, through her entire history down to the present, has never lost sight of the grand doctrine of the atonement through Jesus Christ. The doctrine, it is true, has been obscured and clogged by various errors, especially by the mass, yet, as an objective verity, it holds its place in the Romish system. And whatever differences there are as to doctrines in the different Protestant denominations, regarded as orthodox, they all hold firmly to Christ's vicarious death as the only ground of the sinner's justification—Calvinists and Lutherans, and orthodox Arminians, all utter the same voice, in their several Confessions on the great question of Christ's atonement.

At the opening of the Reformation, Zwingle, Luther, Calvin, Knox and Cranmer, though differing in some points of doctrine, were in perfect accord as to the doctrine of vicarious expiation.

Zwingle (A. D. 1484–1531) was the first of all the Reformers. In his *Expositio Christianæ Fidei De Christo Domino*, he says: "But He suffered, for the purpose of expiating our crimes, a most humiliating form of suffering." "Wherever sin is, death of necessity follows. Christ was without sin, and guile was not found in His mouth. . . . And yet He died this death, He suffered in our stead. He was willing to die that He might restore us to life; and as He had no sins of His own, the all-merciful Father laid ours upon Him."* "He is the sacrifice and victim, satisfying for the sins of all the world for ever."†

Archbishop Cranmer (A. D. 1489–1554), in his *Defence of the True Doctrine of the Sacrament*,‡ says: "One kind of sacrifice there is which is called a propitiatory or merciful sacrifice; that is to say, such a sacrifice as pacifies God's wrath and indignation, and obtains mercy and forgiveness for all our sins, and is the ransom for the redemption from everlasting damnation. . . .

* Zwingle, *Opp. L.*, p. 204.

† *Ibid.*, p. 253.

‡ *Book V.*, § 3.

There is but one such sacrifice, whereby our sins are pardoned, and God's mercy and favor obtained, which is the death of the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ."

The "Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church"—composed by Petrus Mogilas, Metropolitan of Kiew (A. D. 1642), and sanctioned by the Synod of Jerusalem (A. D. 1672), says: * "The death of Christ was of a very different kind from that of other men in these respects: first, because of the weight of our sins; secondly, because He wholly fulfilled the priesthood, even unto the cross; He offered Himself to God and the Father, for the ransoming of the human race. Therefore even to the cross He fulfilled the mediation between God and man." "Jesus Christ, who, when we were enemies, on account of His great love wherewith He loved us, merited justification for us by His most sacred passion on the tree, and satisfied God the Father for us." †

"The first and most excellent satisfaction is, that by which whatever is due by us to God, on account of our sins, has been paid abundantly, although He should deal with us according to the strictest rigor of His justice. This is said to be the satisfaction which we say has appeased God and rendered Him propitious to us; and for it we are indebted to Christ the Lord alone, who, having paid the price of our sins on the cross, most fully satisfied God." ‡

"When it is asked, then, how Christ, by abolishing sin, removed the enmity between God and us, and purchased a righteousness which made Him favorable and kind to us, it may be answered generally, that He accomplished this by the whole course of His obedience. In short, from the moment in which He assumed the form of a servant, He began, in order to redeem us, to pay the price of deliverance. Scripture, however, the more certainly to define the mode of salvation, ascribes it peculiarly and specially to the death of Christ." §

* Winer, page 85.

† Council of Trent, Session 6, chapter vii.

‡ Catechismus Romanus, 2, 5, 63.

§ Calvin's Institutes, book II., chapter xvi., § 5.

The Heidelberg Catechism—in answer to Question 37, What dost thou understand by the words, “He suffered?” says: “That He all the time He lived on earth, but especially at the end of His life, sustained in body and soul the wrath of God against the sins of all mankind; that so by His passion, as the only propitiatory sacrifice, He might redeem our body and soul from everlasting damnation, and obtain for us the favor of God, righteousness and eternal life.” And in answer to Question 44, “Why is it then added, ‘He descended into hell?’ says: “That in my greatest temptations I may be assured, and wholly comfort myself in this, that my Lord Jesus Christ, by His inexpressible anguish, pains, terrors, and hellish agonies in which He was plunged during all His sufferings, but especially on the cross, hath delivered me from the anguish and torments of hell.” *

The Second Helvetic Confession, composed by Bullinger in 1564, and of high authority in the Reformed Churches, says:† “For Christ has taken upon himself and borne our sins, and satisfied the divine justice. God, therefore, on account of Christ as having suffered and risen, is propitiated with reference to our sins, neither does He impute them to us, but reckons the righteousness of Christ as ours, so that we are now not only cleansed and purged, or rendered pure from sins, but are also endowed with the righteousness of Christ, so that we are absolved from sins, death, or condemnation; and, in fine, righteous and heirs of eternal life. Properly speaking, therefore, God alone justifies us, not imputing our sins, but imputing to us His righteousness.” The same doctrine is taught in the Gallic Confession (A. D. 1559), and in the Belgic Confession, revised in 1571, and adopted by the entire Church of Holland. After another revision of the text it was publicly approved by the Synod of Dort, 1618.

The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England pro-

* Whatever may be thought of this answer as an exposition of the question, no one will dissent from the doctrine itself, which it teaches.

† Chapter xv., *De Vera Justificatione*.

duced in their present form in 1562, Article 2: "One Christ, very God, and very man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt (*non tantum pro culpa originis*), but also for all actual sins of men." Article 31: "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone."

The Formula Concordiæ—drawn up by Andrea and others (A. D. 1577), one of the most carefully prepared of all the Lutheran Confessions—says: "That righteousness which before God is of mere grace imputed to faith, or to the believer, is the obedience, suffering and resurrection of Christ, by which He for our sakes satisfied the law, and expiated our sins. For since Christ was not only man, but God and man in one individual person, so He was not subject to the law, nor obnoxious to suffering and death (*ratione suæ personæ*), because He was Lord of the law. On which account His obedience (not merely in respect that He obeyed the Father in His sufferings and death, but also that He for our sakes willingly made Himself subject to the law and fulfilled it by His obedience), is imputed to us, so that God on account of that whole obedience (which Christ by His acting and by His suffering, in His life and His death, for our sake rendered to His Father who is in heaven), remits our sins, reposes us as good and just, and gives us eternal salvation.*

The Westminster Confession (A. D. 1648), to which the Presbyterians of Scotland, Ireland and America adhere, says—"The Lord Jesus by His perfect obedience and sacrifice of Himself, which He through the eternal Spirit once offered up to God, hath fully satisfied the justice of the Father; and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto Him."†

* Formula Concordiæ; p. 684 Hase's Libri Symbolici.

† Westminster Confession, Chapter viii., 35.

The Methodist Episcopal Church holds—"That Jesus Christ, by His oblation of Himself once offered, made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

President Edwards, the great writer on the Will and Original Sin, says: "As there is the same need that Christ's obedience should be reckoned to our account, as that His atonement should; so there is the same reason why it should. As, if Adam had persevered and finished his course of obedience, we should have received the benefit of his obedience, as much as now we have the mischief of his disobedience; so in like manner, there is reason that we should receive the benefit of the second Adam's obedience, as of his atonement of our disobedience.

"Believers are represented in Scripture as being so in Christ, as that they are legally one, or accepted as one, by the supreme Judge; Christ has assumed our nature, and has so assumed all in that nature, that belongs to Him, into such a union with Himself, that He is become their head and has taken them to be His members. And, therefore, what Christ has done in our nature, whereby He did honor to the law and authority of God by His acts, as well as the reparation to the honor of the law by His sufferings, is reckoned to the believer's account."*

J. W. Nevin, D. D., says: "The whole gospel centres in the death of Christ. Here in a profound sense we have the ground of redemption; because here only we have the atonement—the sacrifice which takes away sin, and through this the victory at the same time, which makes room for life and immortality. He was put to death for our offenses, and raised again for our justification. (Rom. 4: 25.) By dying He destroyed death, and him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; so as to deliver them who through fear of death, were all their life-time subject to bondage. (Heb. 2: 14-15). In this sense, the one offering of Christ excludes or shuts out the thought of any

* Edwards' Works, Vol. V., pp. 339, 400.

atonement for sin, any ground of righteousness and peace with God, other than that which is here presented to our faith. It needs no completion from beyond itself, no addition or supplement to itself; and it can bear no rivalry of its claims, no co-ordination of merit or worth, under any other form. It is the only and whole ground of our justification before God." *

We made these somewhat ample quotations from some of the principal confessions, and the writings of representative men to indicate the general faith of the Church in reference to the great and fundamental doctrine of the atonement. They clearly teach without a figure, that "Christ died for our sins," that he satisfied the claims of divine justice, paid the penalty of the law, and so made it "possible for God to be just, and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." And, it is not at all probable that a doctrine so fundamental and vital, so clearly and fully apprehended by the Church in its different sections and for so long a time, should be found at last to be erroneous. In reference to minor points and matters comparatively unessential, there have always existed among Christians differences of opinion, but in reference to Christ's vicarious death, there existed in all the past history of the Church a general unity of sentiment at once gratifying and assuring. At the same time it is regretfully acknowledged that here and there, even in the bosom of the Church itself, views and theories have made their appearance in reference to the great atonement which are clearly at variance with sound doctrine. The scheme of redemption we are defending is that which is taught in God's word, and which has always been the faith of the Church. We have been looking at this scheme in its objective character, as Christ's finished work for man's redemption—a work which lays the foundation for man's personal reconciliation with God. Justice has been satisfied—the claims of law have been fully met. "God can now be just, and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." But though the Father is fully satisfied with the mediation of His Son, still the impenitent sinner re-

* *Mercersburg Review*, Jan. 1870, pp. 100 and 103.

mains under the curse of his violated law. "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "He that believeth not is condemned already." "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." "He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." It does not follow therefore, that because Christ died for all, that all will be saved. *Heidelberg Catechism, Question 20.*—"Are all men, then, as they perished in Adam saved by Christ? No, only those who are ingrafted in Him, and receive all his benefits by a true faith." The gospel feast is prepared, furnished with the viands of divine grace, but only those can partake of its rich provisions, who accept the gracious invitation and come to the feast. In other words, the salvation of the gospel is offered on specific terms; it is not unconditional. "He that believeth shall be saved." And here we are introduced to the great doctrine of justification by faith, a doctrine which for centuries had been obscured, but was brought into the clear light of day in the glorious reformation of the sixteenth century.

To justify is to declare a man to be innocent in relation to law, and free from its penalty. This is the force of the Latin words *justificatio* and *justifico*, as used by ecclesiastical writers. The Greek word *δικαιωω* has almost in every instance the same meaning when used in the New Testament—it signifies to declare, not to constitute righteous. Justification is a forensic act of God, and takes place in the court of heaven. He declares the sinner pardoned who believes in His Son. "Blessed is the man whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." (Ps. 32: 2). "To him give all the prophets witness that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts 10: 43). "For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt. But to him that worketh

not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." (Rom. 4: 3-6). "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 5: 1.) "For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." (2 Cor. 5: 21). "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." (Gal. 2: 16.) "For by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. 2: 8-10.) In these passages, and many others of like import, we are clearly taught that the sinner is justified, pardoned, solely on the ground of Christ's satisfaction. This is the only doctrine that can bring true peace and comfort to the heart of a penitent sinner. He feels that he cannot make atonement for his sins, or change his own heart. Should he attempt to satisfy God for the sins committed against Him, he would soon find that instead of diminishing his debt of guilt, he would daily be adding to it.

"When to the law I trembling fled,
It pour'd its curses on my head,
I no relief could find."

The only hope for the condemned sinner, is in the cross of Christ, the infinite merits of his adorable Mediator.

It is in a high degree satisfactory and comforting to notice how heartily this Pauline doctrine of justification by faith is accepted and insisted on in all the orthodox Confessions. The Westminster Catechism defines *justification* as "An act of God's free grace, wherein He pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in His sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone."

The Heidelberg Catechism in answer to Question 60, "How art thou righteous before God?" says: "Only by a true faith

in Jesus Christ, so that though my conscience accuse me that I have grossly transgressed all the commands of God, and kept none of them, and am still inclined to all evil, notwithstanding God, without any merit of mine, but only of mere grace, grants and imputes to me the perfect satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ; even so, as if I never had had, nor committed any sin; yea as if I had fully accomplished all that obedience which Christ hath accomplished for me, inasmuch as I embrace such benefit with a believing heart." Then follows the question, "Why sayest thou that thou art righteous by faith only?" Answer, "Not that I am acceptable to God on account of the worthiness of my faith, but because only the satisfaction, righteousness and holiness of Christ is my righteousness before God, and that I cannot receive and apply the same to myself any other way than by faith only."

"Faith is the hand that Christ receives,
And takes the treasure which He gives;
But faith no merit can possess,—
Christ is the Lord our righteousness."

Augsburg Confession: "It is taught further, that we cannot obtain righteousness and the forgiveness of sins before God by our own merits, works and atonement; but that we obtain the remission of sins, and are justified before God, by grace for Christ's sake, through faith, if we believe that Christ suffered for us, and that for His sake our sins are remitted unto us, and righteousness and eternal life are bestowed on us. For God regards this faith, and imputes it as righteousness in His sight, as Paul says, Rom. chap. iii. and iv."

This blessed doctrine of justification by faith in Christ we find in all the other Reformed and Lutheran Confessions—all hold this doctrine as the article of a "rising or falling Church."

ERRONEOUS VIEWS OF JUSTIFICATION.

Among the errors which appeared already in the Reformation period, was what may be termed the *Mystical Theory*.

This appeared in a work entitled "Die Deutsche Theologie." This work, whilst it contained much precious truth left the objective work of Christ too much in the back-ground, and leaning too strongly to the subjective side of Christianity. This book teaches that the change wrought in the soul of man is not to be referred so much to the Holy Spirit as to the union of the divine nature with our nature, in virtue of the incarnation. It is held, moreover, that if it were possible for a man to be as pure and obedient as Christ, he would become, through grace, what Christ was by nature. Through this obedience he would become one with God. Christ is not merely objective, isolated in His majesty, but we are called that God should be incarnate in us." This theory seems clearly to involve the pantheistic idea, and so to go beyond the blessed doctrine of a vital union with Christ through faith.

Another wrong theory of justification was developed by *Osiander*, a contemporary of the Reformers. He rejected the forensic, declarative character of justification, and held that the sinner is justified by an *infusion* of righteousness, and not by imputation through faith. This theory was earnestly resisted by all the orthodox reformers, and denounced in the Form of Concord. Somewhat akin to this theory of Osiander, was that of *Schwenkfeld*, who laid special stress on the *human* nature of Christ, and exalted it into the divine. He argued with Osiander in making justification subjective, by the infusion of righteousness. He held, moreover, that the human nature of Christ was not a creature; and, after its full development on earth, was rendered completely divine. Nevertheless, the human nature was not so fully absorbed into the divinity that Christ had but one nature. According to Schwenkfeld's theory of justification, by the infusion of the theanthropic life of Christ, and holding that this conception is absolutely essential to true religion, there could have been no regeneration and fellowship with God under the Old Testament dispensation. And when confronted with this grave objection to his theory, he at once, and candidly admitted its force. In a Sendbrief,

written in 1532, in which he contrasts the Old and New Testament economies, he takes the position that under the Jewish dispensation justification and regeneration could not take place, and no one could be saved, and so the patriarchs themselves were lost forever.

Still other errors in connection with the atonement and its application have appeared at different periods in the history of the Church, but their consideration would give undue length to this article, and hence we will close with the following

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

1. A careful study of the great scheme of redemption, and the history of Christian dogmas in general, ought to deepen conviction as to the fundamental importance of a sound **CHRISTOLOGY**. How very different everything in the life of Christ appears if He be viewed from the Trinitarian, or the Unitarian standpoint. If from the former, evrything in the life of Christ is invested with a divine dignity and merit. Viewed from this standpoint, there is no room for the moral theory of redemption, nor for any of the other false theories noticed in this paper. Our fallen race needs a Redeemer who is not only man, however wise and pure, but one who is at the same time divine, invested with all the attributes of the Father, and so infinitely superior to all creatures and beyond the possibility of erring or falling. A Saviour is needed who might die not as a martyr, as an example of love and patient suffering, but one whom the Father could accept as a sacrifice for the sins of our fallen race.

And, thanks be unto God, such a Saviour has been provided, "who has been made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." "He is the propitiation for our sins." And yet this blessed doctrine of Christ's vicarious death is constantly and earnestly opposed by Unitarians and rationalists. To their *reason* Christ's death upon the cross was simply an exhibition of God's displeasure against sin, and designed to make a moral impression on the intelligent uni-

verse. Should this rationalistic conception of Christ's death ever prevail—which, thank God, it never will—what would become of our present orthodox theological nomenclature, and in what a sorry light it would place our books of devotion and Church-psalmody, both English and German. No more would be heard the touching and expressive hymn :

"There is a fountain fill'd with blood,
Drawn from Immanuel's veins ;
And sinners, plunged beneath that flood,
Lose all their guilty stains."

Or :

"Ich habe nun den Grund gefunden,
Der meinen Anker ewig halt,
Wo anders als in Jesu wunden ;
Da lag er vor der Zeit der Welt ;
Den Grund der unbeweglich steht,
Wann End und Himmel untergeht."

No, the theme of the cross will never grow old, will never cease to be precious. The awakened penitent sinner will ever direct his streaming eyes to the cross, and like Bunyan's pilgrim, will be relieved of his burden, which will roll into the empty sepulchre of Jesus. Every Christian, on his pilgrimage to the celestial city, will bear with him the Apostle's motto, "Christ and Him crucified," and will never cease to sing :

"Dear dying Lamb, Thy precious blood
Shall never lose its pow'r,
Till all the ransom'd Church of God
Be sav'd to sin no more!"

2. The question has, of late years especially, occupied some minds as to the relative importance to be attached in the scheme of redemption, to the incarnation, or to Christ's final sufferings and death. It might be answered that one is as necessary as the other, and that Christ's active obedience was as necessary as His passive obedience, and that His burial and resurrection were as necessary as His death on the cross. The question cannot however be satisfactorily decided in this way, as it can be said in truth that in the work of redemption Christ's human

nature was as necessary as the divine, without intending to affirm that the human is equal to the divine in dignity. The fundamental importance of the incarnation has already been admitted, and also the obedience of Christ through His entire life, as being part of the satisfaction rendered to God's violated law. We wish to assert, however, that the chief merit of the mediatorial scheme is found in Christ's passive obedience, and especially in His final sufferings and death on the cross. The Heidelberg Catechism, in answer to Question 37—What dost thou understand by the words "He suffered?"—says: "That He all the time He lived on earth, but *especially at the end of His life*, sustained in body and soul the wrath of God against the sins of all mankind, that so by His passion as the *only propitiatory sacrifice*, He might redeem our body and soul from everlasting damnation, and obtain for us the favor of God, righteousness, and eternal life." And, Quest. 44. Why is there added, "He descended into hell?" Ans. "That in my greatest temptations I may be assured and wholly comfort myself in this, that my Lord Jesus Christ, by His inexpressible anguish, pains, terrors, and hellish agonies in which He was plunged during all His sufferings, but *especially on the cross*,* hath delivered me from the anguish and torments of hell." The Catechism clearly regards Christ's sufferings and death on the cross not only as the termination of His passion, but as comprehending His most extreme sufferings in body and soul, and so involving the *centre* of merit in the great work of atonement. And this is so clearly taught in the Word of God that it would seem impossible to come to any other conclusion. "I delivered unto you *first of all*, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." (1 Cor. xv. 3.) Besides, the apostle Paul certifies that Christ delivered us from the curse of the law by His most ignominious and painful death on the cross. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." (Gal. iii. 13.) And we

* Italics mine.

know of no authorized confession of faith which does not maintain that Christ in a special sense and degree brought man to God by His death on the cross. Any theory therefore that in the least degree even obscures the glory of the cross is a grave wrong to Jesus Christ, and tends to imperil the salvation of souls.

3. The theory of justification by an *infusion* of Christ's righteousness, which, as we have seen, gave the Church trouble in the Reformation period, has been here and there revived. The theory confounds justification and sanctification. And though both are always joined, they are not one and the same. The distinction as held in all orthodox confessions should be carefully maintained.

4. The Church should be jealous of a *progressive theology*. We do not deny, of course, progress in theological science. There is danger, however, in regarding that progress, which is retrogression. There has appeared in the Christian world a tendency to ignore, to a great extent, the historic past, and to treat old, orthodox systems as effete and obsolete. The shibboleth of this new school is a scientific, progressive theology, greater liberality of thought. With them nothing is fixed, nothing reliable. To this class belong such men as Dr. Macrae, of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, who made the statement that the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church are "antiquated, unjustifiable, and a distortion of the teachings of the Scriptures." With such a wholesale rejection of a venerable creed we certainly can have no sympathy. A hankering after new systems of theology indicates a sickly theological sentiment. The best systems of theology produced both in the old country and America for the last score or more of years are just those that come nearest the old. It is the old creeds, catechisms, prayer-books and hymns that we joyfully press to our hearts, and exclaim with a grateful appreciation, "The old wine is better than the new!" Away then with new systems of theology, from whatever source they may emanate, and by whatever title they may flaunt themselves upon the world. Pray,

what have the authors of such systems, these restless, dissatisfied spirits, however learned, and who are so clamorous for a progressive theology, accomplished? Have they discovered a single fundamental doctrine? We answer without hesitation—Not one. As already intimated, there is indeed a sense in which theological science is progressive, but not in the sense of mystifying God's word by metaphysical distinctions and speculations, instead of bringing out the truth, if possible, in a clear and more prominent light. Any system of theology that professes to be new lays itself open, by such very profession, to suspicion. It can not, and ought not, to be trusted. Besides, even the claim to originality on behalf of these systems is in the main a fraud. They are not really new, as every careful student of Church history, theology and philosophy well knows. The contents of these systems are to a great extent exhumed from the past—in a new dress, it may be, and in new combinations. Let no one envy the compilers of these systems; let no one crave their notoriety. Alas! what a poor—what a wretched reward! purchased at the expense of God's precious truth, the peace and comfort of immortal souls, and the unity and prosperity of the Church of God!

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE ARTIST AND HIS MISSION—A Study in Æsthetics. By Rev. William M. Reily, Ph. D., Professor of Ancient Languages, Palatinate College. Philadelphia: John E. Potter & Co., 617 Sansom street.

A chapter of this work was published some time ago in the *Reformed Quarterly Review*, and we took occasion then to express our commendation of the manner in which the subject was treated. This handsome volume has since come into our hands. It is gotten up in good style, and its contents more than meet the expectations we formed upon reading the chapter referred to. The work is modest in its pretensions, and yet gives evidence that the author has well mastered the subject he treats. The subject of Æsthetics, as a branch of philosophy, has not occupied much attention in our American Colleges. It is much more extensively studied and treated by German writers. The field is certainly a most important and interesting one. Dr. Reily confines himself in this work mainly to the subjective side of the general subject, directing attention to the nature of the *phantasy*. But this necessarily involves constant reference to the beautiful objectively considered. The "Sense of Beauty" requires and implies a world or realm of beauty to be apprehended, and the author's theory of the nature of beauty in itself appears to us correct. The Beautiful belongs to the same order as the True and the Good. Though revealed through sensuous forms, and apprehended by the phantasy through the senses, yet, in itself, it is something spiritual. It has truth for its contents, and is elevating in its influence on man. The mission of the artist is, therefore, pure and lofty. He ministers at no sensuous shrine, but seeks the spiritual through visible forms. His art is not a mere instrument to something beyond itself, but finds its end in itself. We are of the opinion that the sense for the beautiful, which is found in that department of the mind which we have designated by the term *Phantasy*, beginning in sense-perception and reaching upwards through conception, fancy and the imagination, does not receive sufficient attention and treatment in our psychologies, and is not made sufficient account of in our methods of education. We are glad, therefore, that Dr. Reily has treated this subject, and treated it so ably and well. His reading and study have evidently prepared him to give to the public some thoughts on the beautiful in nature and art which would still further meet a want and be favor-

ably received. We hope, therefore, that he may be sufficiently encouraged by the attention this little volume receives to publish another of similar character in the future. We have read the present volume with great profit and pleasure.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ART, Being the Second Part of Hegel's *Æsthetik*, in which are unfolded historically the three great fundamental phases of The Art-Activity of the world. Translated, and accompanied with an Introductory Essay giving an outline of the entire "*Æsthetik*." By Wm. M. Bryant. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 549 and 551 Broadway.

The revival of interest in the German Philosophy, especially of Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, has been much stimulated by "The Journal of Speculative Philosophy," (edited by William T. Harris), which has done a great work in presenting the systems of those giant philosophers in an English dress, as well as in producing able original criticisms upon the same. This volume, on The Philosophy of Art, in its English dress, here noticed, is one of the results of this revival. It is a beautiful volume in mechanical execution, and its rich contents will fully supply a most careful study. The subject is treated under the well-known three-fold division, Symbolic Art, Classic Art, and Romantic Art. Each of these then have a three-fold sub-division, 1st. The Naïve, Unconscious Symbolical, 2d. The Symbolic of the Sublime, and 3d. Reflective Symbolism. Under the head of Classic Art we have, 1st. Development of Classic Art, 2d. The Ideal of Classic Art, and 3d. Destruction of Classic Art. The third division, Symbolic Art, gives us, 1st. The Religious Circle of Romantic Art, 2d. Chivalry, and 3d. Formal Independence of character. These sub-divisions have still further three fold sub-divisions, in which the interest of the subject is brought out with the masterly ability of the great thinker. The trinity, Thesis, Antithesis, and Synthesis, is the order according to which, in the mind of Hegel, all thought develops.

"Symbolic Art *seeks* this perfect unity of the idea with the external form; Classic Art *finds* it, for the senses and the imagination, in the representation of spiritual individuality; Romantic Art *transcends* it in its infinite spirituality, which rises above the spiritual world."

If we wish to find the metaphysics of The Beautiful there is, perhaps, no richer source than Hegel. Together with the other great names we have mentioned, his is the great store-house from which all philosophical thinkers since his day have gathered rich material. Subsequent criticism has so fully pointed out his faults, his pantheistic leanings, that ordinary minds may now study his works without danger, and with that interest which a master mind always awakens.

HISTORICAL LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, with Notes, Critical, Historical and Explanatory. By C. J. Ellicott, D. D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, Author of critical and grammatical commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1881.

It is not our purpose to do more than simply direct attention to this work as one of the books that will richly reward careful study. It consists of eight lectures. 1. Introductory considerations on the characteristics of the Four Gospels. 2. The Birth and Infancy of Christ. 3. The early Judean Ministry. 4. The Ministry in Eastern Galilee. 5. The Ministry in Northern Galilee. 6. The Journeyings toward Jerusalem. 7. The Last Passover. 8. The Forty Days. Though different in plan, and not so extensive or expanded as, for instance, Lange's *Life of Christ*, it brings within a small compass one of the very best critical studies on the life of our Lord. No one, we think, interested in such studies, will be disappointed in this work. It is embraced within 380 pages, but there is no waste or superfluous matter in it.

ELlicott's COMMENTARIES, CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL, ON THE EPISTLES OF SAINT PAUL, with revised translations. Andover: Warren F. Draper, Main street. 1881.

The first volume contains Galatians, Ephesians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, and the second volume, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy and Titus. These commentaries have been before the public, in part at least, for some time. They are not popular in their character, but for the student or minister who desires to study the original text, they are not easily excelled.

The only work of a like character and plan that compares favorably with them is the work of Dr. Lightfoot, published by the same publishing house. Both are devoted simply to the critical and grammatical elucidation of the text. Ellicott says, "It is under these feelings that I have undertaken a commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, which, by confining itself to the humble and less ambitious sphere of grammatical details, may give the student some insight into the language of the New Testament, and enable him with more assured steps, to ascend the difficult heights of exegetical and dogmatical theology. There is danger that the extensive doctrinal and homiletical commentaries that have been sent forth from the press of late years, may lead young students away from the critical study of the text, and that they will thus unconsciously lean too much upon the opinions of others in regard to questions and things on which they should form an independent judgment. Such a commentator as Ellicott is the best aid, together with a M. T. Grammar, such as Winer's, and a M. T. Lexicon, such as Robinson's or Cremer's, in determining the grammatical meaning of the text. After

that is done there is room to consult others in regard to the doctrinal sense, but not in such a way as to weaken one's reliance on his own judgment.

THE NATION: The Foundations of Civil Order and Political Life in the United States. By Elisha Mulford, LL.D. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. The Riverside Press, Cambridge. 1881.

This work merits an extended article instead of a brief notice, and requires it in order to be able at all to set forth its sterling value. We commend it as the best that has come under our notice on the subject of which it treats. The view which it presents of the origin and nature of the Nation, though much more fully elaborated, is the same we have been teaching our classes in the College in Ethics, in the lectures on the State. The whole subject opened up familiarly as we read its pages, and we followed on with consent and assent from the beginning to the close. It presents the true ethical basis for political economy, or whatever science is occupied with the study of government and the state in its more external aspects. We thank our friend, a member of the Senate of Maryland, for calling our attention to the work, and we feel that we have enriched our library by giving it a place therein.

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF MARK. By Revere F. Weidner, M. A., B. D., Pastor of St. Luke's Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Philadelphia, &c. Embracing the Authorized Version of 1611 and the Revised Version of 1881. Allentown, Pa.: Brobst, Diehl & Co. Philadelphia: The Lutheran Book-store. 1881.

This volume of 300 pages, 8vo., is designed more especially for "teachers and Bible classes," and the author's aim has been also to present the Scriptures "in the plain form in which they are to be taught by the head of a family." It has been carefully prepared, and contains questions at the foot of the page as a help and guide in its study and use.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE JEWISH CHURCH. Twelve Lectures on Biblical Criticism. By W. Robertson Smith, M. A. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1881.

Those who desire to know something of the controversy on the inspiration of the Bible that has recently been agitating the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, and also of the tendency of modern Biblical criticism, will receive some light on these subjects in this volume.